PROCEEDINGS

of the

FORTY-FOURTH MEETING

of the

National Conference of Catholic Charities

COLUMBUS, OHIO

September 19 - 23, 1958

HV
88
A22
1958
GTU Storage

Gift of

Mary's Help Hospital Library

PROCEEDINGS

of the

FORTY-FOURTH MEETING

of the

National Conference of Catholic Charities

COLUMBUS, OHIO

September 19 - 23, 1958

HV
88
A22
1958

THIS CONFERENCE DOES NOT VOTE ON ANY QUESTIONS DISCUSSED. THE VIEWS EXPRESSED DURING THE SESSIONS ARE TO BE ACCEPTED ONLY AS PERSONAL OPINIONS OF THE AUTHORS.

Copyright, National Conference of Catholic Charities, Washington, D. C., 1960
Merkle Press Inc., Washington, D. C.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART I

Page

Solemn Pontifical Mass 1

Keynote Address, Rt. Rev. Msgr. George H. Guilfoyle..... 2

Presidential Address, Very Rev. Msgr. William L. Wozniak..... 10

An Evaluation and Rededication, George E. Heneghan..... 14

A Welcome to Columbus, Most Rev. Clarence G. Issenmann..... 19

Some Needs in American Social Welfare, Hon. Arthur S. Flemming .. 20

Meeting the Challenge of an Exploding Civilization, Albert Mayer.... 26

Competence in Charity, Dudley L. Baker 38

America and the Problems of Intolerance, Commissioner Charles Abrams 45

PART II

SECTIONAL MEETINGS

Service to Families—The Function of Voluntary Agencies, Anthony K. Kaye 51

Summary, Roger Scott 57

Confidentiality—A Keystone in Catholic Social Service, Rev. Ernest L. Unterkoefler 57

Summary, Rev. John Ahearn 63

Family Life Education—A Responsibility of Catholic Charities Agencies:

1. Joseph W. Fenstemacher 65

2. William G. Martindale 68

Summary, Jack Lyons 72

Suburbia—Whither Catholic Charities:

1. Miss Helen McDaniel 72

2. Ralph Henry Smith 78

Summary, Miss Helen McDaniel..... 89

American Immigration Policy in Perspective, Robert H. Amundson... 90

The Refugee and U. S. Legislation:

1. Very Rev. Msgr. Thomas J. Rilley 100

2. Charles A. O'Neill 109

3. Pierce J. Gerety 113

Summary, Mrs. Joan Davis..... 117

The Contribution of Children's Institutions in Service to the Community:

1. Walter Suckowiecki 119

2. Children's Institutions in the Diocese of Erie Meet Community Needs, Sister Mary Leo, S.S.J. 124

Summary, Sister Mary Leo S.S.J..... 127

340180

PART III

CONFERENCE ORGANIZATION

Business Session

Page

Report of the Secretary, Rt. Rev. Msgr. John O'Grady 129

Report of the Committee on Resolutions, Mr. Thomas J. O'Donnell .. 133

Report of the Committee on Time and Place, Rt. Rev. Msgr. George H. Guilfoyle 135

Financial Report 136

Report of the Committee on Nominations, Very Rev. Msgr. Julius J. Szabo 137

Officers, National Conference of Catholic Charities, 1958 138

Officers, Directors of Catholic Charities, Standing Committee, 1958 .. 139

Officers, Conference of Religious, Standing Committee, 1958 139

Columbus Committee 140

Index 141

PROCEEDINGS

of the

FORTY-FOURTH MEETING

of the

National Conference of Catholic Charities

PART I

SOLEMN PONTIFICAL MASS

Sunday, September 21, 1958, 12:30 P. M.

St. Joseph Cathedral

Celebrant: Most Rev. Clarence G. Issenmann, S.T.D.
Bishop of Columbus.

Deacons of Honor: Msgr. William L. Wozniak, President,
National Conference of Catholic Charities; Executive Director, Catholic Charities of Buffalo.

Msgr. George H. Guilfoyle, LL.M., *Director, Catholic Charities of the Archdiocese of New York.*

Deacon of Mass: Rev. Hubert T. Unger, *Cincinnati, Ohio.*

Sub-deacon of Mass: Rev. Paul Metzger, *Cincinnati, Ohio.*

Preacher: Most Rev. Christopher J. Weldon, D.D.,
Bishop of Springfield, Mass.

KEYNOTE ADDRESS

THE ESSENTIAL INTEGRATION: THE CHALLENGE FACING SOCIAL WELFARE

Rt. Rev. Msgr. George H. Guilfoyle, *Executive Director, Catholic Charities of the Archdiocese of New York*

WHAT is the impact of Catholic social welfare on our society? What special contribution should Catholic social welfare make to a society having such varying religious beliefs, such diverse racial traditions, and all shades of philosophical commitment? Turbulent times testify to the compelling need of clarity of purpose and soundness of principle. More insistent with respect to the field of education, this urgency nevertheless challenges social welfare and its leaders. Sound concepts of human needs obviously can be derived from right principles concerning the nature of man.

Each day we hear of the multiple problems confronting the individual, the family and the community. Society is shaken by increasing pressures and disturbing changes—pressures arising from migrant populations, racial differences, mass unemployment, war involvements; changes due especially to astounding advances in the sciences as well as in technical skills. Moreover, at the very time that material well-being has so prospered, we are witness to an astonishing increase in personal insecurity, delinquency and family breakdown. Can this be due in part to the fact that in America we have arrived at a point where tolerance and open-mindedness elicit greater acclaim than truth itself, where these qualities, precious as they are, frequently are divorced from principle and morality? Social welfare, indeed, faces a challenge which can be avoided only with individual guilt and collective shame.

Almighty God has been good to America. Our liberty is doubly cherished as we contemplate the large number of our brothers, of the past and present, who have never known, or who have lost the blessing of political freedom. We need no reminder of what men steeped in the natural law and the Christian gospel have contributed to the form and spirit of our political system. The basic American edifice was founded on the conviction that man is a creature of God endowed with unalienable rights and

corresponding duties. For the most part, the thinking and aspirations of the first leadership of our nation indicated belief in universal precepts and fundamental truth. The American dream centered on belief in the common man, accompanied by widespread acknowledgment of God and His Will for men.

That the colonists were successful in launching their new nation is an amazing fact. If John Adams is right, only a third of the people desired war. Nevertheless, succeed they did, largely because of the greatness of George Washington and the aid of France, and also because of the inspiration of the principles for which they shed their blood.

We know that the passion for political and economic equality, so important to our earlier history, did not beget the full implementation of Jefferson's pronouncement, "We hold these truths to be self-evident. . . ." Indeed, the record reveals a sad decline in general acceptance of fundamental, immutable principles, taken for granted by our forefathers who spoke reverently of "self-evident truths," "creatures endowed by their Creator," "unalienable rights."

Naturalism, materialism, secularism have eaten away at our culture and deteriorated our way of thinking and judging and acting. The nature of democracy itself, no doubt, is party to some of this difficulty. Some accept a course as right if the majority wants it. This is but one step removed from the more fallacious persuasion, that right and truth are not determinate but are relative and exist only as determined by the majority. In understandable zeal for freedom and practically religious commitment to democracy, many fail to realize that freedom is not an end in itself.

If we were to put in one word the greatest need today of society in general and social welfare in particular, the word, I think, is "order." The challenge to Catholic social welfare is to establish right order in its field. The challenge is to transform the world, not to stand aside from it; not to condemn the secular, but to integrate it with the spiritual. The Christian attitude should not be one of rejection of the world, but one of consecration. Our part is to vivify our society and its forms with the spirit and content of eternal values, of Christian doctrine and moral principles; in other words, to bring to our way of life, and to social welfare in particular, the fullness of truth and morality known by reason and revelation. Today men seek to satisfy their needs, to fill the yearnings of their hearts and to bring light to the dark-

ness of their minds by various forms of humanism, most of it secular and materialistic, some of it Marxist. While erroneous and incomplete answers win the allegiance of peoples, we have the true humanism. We have the knowledge of the true and the good for which men's minds and wills hunger. So often we are passive, isolated, even inconsistent in our attitude to the view of life which we espouse, and which we should eagerly bring to the marketplace and to the world. And the consequence? Henri de Lubac has stated it. He says, "It is not true as seems sometimes to be said, that without God man cannot organize the world. What is true is that, in the last analysis without God he can only organize the world against himself."

In 1953 Pope Pius XII urged a group of Italian teachers to be at once "citizens of earth and elect of heaven." If we are to help organize our society and social welfare into a world ordered as God wants, we must be citizens of earth and elect of heaven. That means that while ever conscious of Eternal Glory, we must also be active, dedicated members of the City of Man. We must, indeed, present the spirit and content of Christian humanism to the mind and ways of men.

The late Archbishop of Paris, Cardinal Suhard, said: "In the researches you make and the reforms you propose, you alone will be the best humanists, for you alone have it in you to provide the emerging civilization with a standard which will be complete, namely, the right conception of man. It is the Christian conception of human nature, and it alone, which will save man from being dehumanized."

The good Christian sees man in his total nature and in his complete historical, philosophical and theological setting. He sees man as God's creature, fallen, redeemed, and destined for Heaven; a person of divinely given dignity and rights; a being for whose services lower creation is fashioned but a being who is himself to love and serve his Creator and to love affectively and effectively his fellow man. Yet, the secular humanist should have no more proper concern for true human needs than does the good Christian. Man's bodily needs are neither to be ignored nor despised—they were fashioned by Almighty God Himself. We are not pure spirits. Indeed, in seeking to help man's soul, we do well to help his body. The body serves the soul and will share eternal reward or punishment. We should not view man as possessed of merely

an eternal destiny or of merely a worldly destiny; he must be seen in his role in the temporal order and in the light of his ultimate destiny. This is how "Christian" transforms humanism. The Christian humanist is the true Christian. His Christianity provides the only integrated view of man—complete in his temporal and eternal destiny. It teaches the worth here and hereafter of each human being and the brotherhood of all under God. It leaves no room in conscience or in practice for theories of inherent supremacy or inferiority based on race or color.

Catholic social welfare must integrate Christian humanism and social welfare's objectives and performance—else why have Catholic welfare organizations and institutions? Catholic social work must carry on the social work of Christ. Our Saviour taught us the measure and spirit in which to love and to serve our neighbor. Is our casework enlivened with our Christian heritage? Do our theories of social welfare reflect the Christian creed and code? Do we apply in our day-to-day work our understanding of virtue and of sin? Do we commit the error of so many who on the one hand extol freedom as an end in itself, and in practice reject it by sweeping denial of guilt for personal wrong doing?

The term, "Christian humanism," it seems to me, is one that can be used to provoke reflection on how well or poorly we join the material and the spiritual, the natural and the supernatural. Christian humanism contains the doctrinal riches, the understanding, the ennobling motivation which should permeate our services to our fellow man. Who else has such food for hungry men, such strength for the insecure, such light to dispel the darkness of mind so prevalent even in this land of plenty? Must we not strive to contribute that heritage to the world about us? Even if in our time we cannot achieve full acceptance, can we not help to bring fundamental truths to the plans and organizations of society?

If Catholic social welfare is to influence men and their social forms, the characteristics of our Christian way of life must be verified in us and must be fostered by us. Certain marks of Christ's own require special stress in our personal conduct and in our charitable works and objectives or else we do not measure up to our cause.

The Christian attitude to human need demands a sense of personal responsibility. Such a sense of personal responsibility is

begotten of a loving heart and of respect for the intrinsic worth and rights of the one served because of love of God. We are a dying people when we abandon to government the charitable works we can and should accomplish ourselves, individually when we can, through voluntary agencies when such organizations are necessary.

The Christian attitude to human need must be marked also by a practice of sharing. That means giving that involves sacrificing. It means giving of one's self, one's time, one's energy, not merely of one's surplus. Paradoxically, it is in that emptying of ourselves that we shall be filled.

The Christian attitude to human need must be marked by the fact and spirit of personal service. By personal service of neighbor we imitate Christ. Perhaps all we can offer is sympathy and kindly attention but often indeed that is what one's neighbor most needs—the compassion of one brother's heart for another.

Moreover, the Christian attitude must be marked by respect for lawful authority. Such respect is founded on acceptance of eternal truths and immutable moral laws. We have adverted to the decline in our country in acceptance of the inviolable moral principles acknowledged by our Founding Fathers. The consequent disrespect for authority and for moral values is the prime source of the great maladies of our time. The deleterious effects are seen in broken homes, wayward children, empty hearts.

Happily, however, it is possible today to recognize the beginning of a repudiation of the false liberalism of recent decades. For instance, this year on May 1st, throughout the land there was inaugurated a movement known as "Law Day, U.S.A." On that day, eminent leaders took time to reflect on the importance of law and order to a peaceful society. More significantly, they paused to give witness to the principles and values on which our law, our government and institutions are founded. Roscoe Pound, Dean Emeritus of Harvard Law School, in his remarks on that occasion, strongly stressed the importance of principle to the well-being of the nation. Professor Jerome Hall of the Indiana University School of Law, writing in a recent issue of the *Virgina Law Review,* states that the "most striking fact about current national development is the rise of natural law philosophies almost everywhere." And Mr. Justice Douglas of the U. S. Supreme Court, has written: "In our scheme of things the rights of man

are unalienable. They come from the Creator, not from a President, a legislature or a Court." A Pennsylvania Court recently declared, "Our Federal and State Constitution assume that the moral code which is part of God's order in the world exists as the substance of society."

We find also in the recent literature on social work renewed interest in universal precepts, indeed, a yearning for standards and basic philosophy. For instance, an article on values and standards points out that ethical neutrality is just not possible.

Many of today's social workers cling to six essential values with regard to the nature of man and society. The Catholic can and does go along with his fellow social workers in many areas but his philosophical and theological orientation can and should provide deeper meaning and greater enrichment. For instance:

1. The Catholic social worker proclaims the dignity of man along with his fellow workers but he recognizes not only a natural dignity but also supernatural worth.

2. The Catholic social worker respects human life not merely as a natural mystery, he endows it with the sacredness of eternal destiny.

3. The Catholic social worker is extremely concerned about the rights of children but adds to this concern the higher endowment of supernatural childhood under an ever-loving Father.

4. The Catholic social worker seeks the protection of the bond between husband and wife but is fully aware of their involvement in an eternal triangle with God at the apex.

5. The Catholic social worker feels his obligation toward the adolescent, the widow and the aged, mindful always, however, that their future is wrapped in the merciful protection of the Good Shepherd.

6. The Catholic social worker sees the rights and duties of men and society not merely as demanding freedom but freedom under God and His law.

Social welfare, therefore, has its values but it has not adopted, and will not automatically adopt the content of the natural law, let alone the fullness of Christian humanism. We must produce leaders in thought and action equal to the accomplishment of this task.

The colossal welfare need in America today, therefore, is for a dynamic leadership which will infuse our programs and objec-

tives with the light of truth and the norms of morality. It must be a leadership that recognizes and applies eternal truths concerning man, the family and the state. That need is implied in the theme of this Conference: "Charity and Clarity in Purpose; Competence and Compassion in Practice." Sound purpose and practical competence marked by charity and compassion. The divorce of society from God, the goal of the secularist, can only bring decay. Very much needed are unity of men under God and society's recognition of God's law in its planning. This is *not* to urge union of Church and State—it is to urge that, despite their cultural pluralism, men recognize and observe their dependence upon God and their brotherhood under Him. Oh yes, we want them freely to go further and to accept the full Christian revelation, but nevertheless may they come back at least to fundamentals! Surely, we can hope to see realized in our life time, in our laws and in our public and private programs, increased respect for religion and for fundamental truths.

What then must you and I do to help transform the world? Obviously ours must be a leadership that reaches out into the community. It is vital that Catholics think in terms of the common good of the total community and infiltrate it. We are not alien to the society in which we live. We need not have an inferiority complex. We must enter public life. Otherwise, we do not contribute to the formation of our social institutions, our public policy and our laws in accord with Christian truth and morals.

Our world is full of heroism and sacrifice but it worships false gods. We cannot turn away from this world and build a new one. We must be citizens of the City of Man. To transform it, as de la Bodoyere said, "Somehow the Christian must solve the problem of presenting himself to the world as wholly other, with a life more intense, more real, deeper and higher and yet as one with the world, sharing *its* intensity, *its* reality, *its* depths, and *its* heights." To accomplish these goals, we must seek support of men of good will of different religious and cultural backgrounds. Such good will, despite occasional local tensions and controversies, can be found everywhere.

Christianity must not be let appear indifferent to the concerns of this world. Our lives must show that men can and do and should live up to its doctrinal claims and moral code. "The Church

and Christians should be a monstrance carrying Christ and Christ's order into the world's marketplace."

While we affirm our faith in eternal moral laws and a future life, we need be second to none in fostering man's temporal rights and needs and in defending the political and economic and social equality of all men. Pope Pius XII said that true religion and "profound humaneness" are sisters, not rivals. It is, therefore, for us to offer the world the breathtaking beauty and the ennobling motivation that are part and products of our creed and code. It is for us to weave them fittingly into our own labors and into the fabric of our laws and practices. A Christian humanism stresses not only man's rights but God's plan for him, the nature God gave him, the inherent needs, especially of intellect and will, which God implanted in him. Without God, man is restless. In the innate hunger that begets that restlessness and insecurity, do we not have our great opportunity to serve our brother and make provision for the total man, body and soul? If the principles that guide our casework, our psychiatry, our institutional programs are to be good, must they not only have the best in techniques but also be formed in accord with the True and the Good?

And so, in this age that stresses man's ability to unravel the secrets of the material universe, it is our role not only to use the very best of human science and skills but also to interpret the problems of men and to help meet human needs in the light of the divine science, the knowledge and means made known by Almighty God through reason, through revelation and through the inspiration of the Holy Spirit.

Yes, we must bring the food of truth to hungry souls. We must do it with compassion, with the warmth of charity and with the spirit of brotherliness. In that way, we can face with confidence the challenge to transform the world, the challenge to integrate the goals and principles of social welfare with the nature of man, the creature and child of a loving God.

"It is not true, as seems sometimes to be said, that without God man cannot organize the world. What is true is that, in the last analysis without God he can only organize the world against himself."

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS

OUR OBJECTIVES—PAST, PRESENT AND FUTURE

Very Rev. Msgr. William L. Wozniak
Diocesan Director of Catholic Charities, Buffalo, N. Y.

IN APRIL, 1957, our Holy Father expressed himself in this manner to the members of the Institute of Trinite-des-Monts. "The task of Catholic Action is more urgent and more important than ever, for the enemy of human nature musters experts ever more numerous and inveterate in his efforts to make the laws of matter prevail over those of the spirit. Every devout Christian should say with the Apostle: 'For the love of Christ impels us, because we have come to the conclusion that, since one died for all, therefore all died; and that Christ died for all, in order that they who are alive may live no longer for themselves, but for Him Who died for them and rose again.' It is from the Heart of Jesus that you will draw zeal for souls and the spirit of sacrifice which is its touchstone. . . ."

This indeed, is the aim and heart-throb of the National Conference of Catholic Charities, to instill this spirit of action, not just in its own staff members, but in all the groups of volunteers whose purpose it is to further the mission of Christ upon this earth. As we reflect upon the theme which was set up for our National Conference a year ago, we recognize the dynamic spirit of Christ which moves us to spend ourselves for others.

Last year, in explaining the theme of the Conference, it was stated, "While our zeal and dedication is personalized for us by the example of Christ, the adequacy and the expertness of our service must be equally present. Only then can we breathe the spirit of love into the daily lives of our brothers in need. One without the other falls short of our goal, 'All things to all men for the love of God.'"

Here then, in capsule form, are the proper motives. This gives life to our work. Here too, is the encouragement to use the best scientific methodology in our objectives of helping and counseling people. As we speak about the various aspects of our work, we can never lose sight of the fact that it really is Catholic Action in motion—it is the dynamic expression of our love for mankind. Under the guidance of our hierarchy, it is imperative that our workers become imbued with the spirit of Christ's love

for mankind, without deviating from good, sound, basic concepts of casework. These aspects complement one another. It is impossible for such a large body of lay people working for the Church and for the recognition of mankind as God's creatures, to remain passive, free of the challenges laid upon it by Our Lord, His Church, or even scientific progress. Passiveness brings about complacency and inactivity. Action will give meaning to the Christian philosophy of life as taught by Christ Himself; action of this kind benefits all people, the "doers" and the "receivers."

Through all the years of the National Conference of Catholic Charities, our viewpoint has been directed toward the various phases of human problems. We believed that through the organization of Catholic Charities, better service could be given to our needy, and more effective results could be achieved. We have been interested in child welfare; we have been interested in family welfare; we have been interested in the care of the aging. With time, basic interests expanded into co-related interests, such as the social security programs, housing and medical programs. We were involved in many new developments. After almost half a century of existence, the National Conference of Catholic Charities is still confronted with the same basic problems, the care of children, the care of the family and the care of the aging. Our basic interests still remain the same. In 1958, however, as through the years, new horizons in dealing with human problems have been developed. Better techniques have been evolved, yet, with all this, the essential foundation of all human endeavors to help one another rests on the virtue of charity—and since charity knows no bounds, neither do our interests and concern for human problems.

I need not bring to your attention the advances that have been made in the whole area of social welfare in the United States in the last few years. I do say that Catholic Charities has made great contributions. We have contributed to the development of the social security programs; we have been heard in the area of housing; we have been recognized in many aspects of child welfare, in health, in youth work, and in other related fields. But as the Church is dynamic in its philosophy, so is Catholic Charities. Insofar as the meaning of the virtue of charity permeates more and more every aspect of life, so does it become the direct force expanding the interests of the Catholic Charities movement.

We have always sought to have the place of the Church in child welfare recognized. This we shall never stop striving for. Even in the current revision of Child Welfare Services, we have been emphasizing some of these interests to the Federal Government by presenting to them our advice, counsel and experience in child welfare.

As we look forward to the 1960 White House Conference on Children and Youth, we must exert every influence toward having the place of religion in caring for children recognized.

In the area of family casework, especially with the developing program of marriage counseling, we adhere to the basic philosophy that the family is the fundamental unit of society. Whether we speak of casework in child welfare, or in family welfare, we must come to the basic realization that the family unit is the most important factor in our society. As we raise the social level and standards of living, we see in similar degree the development of a stronger community. That is the reason for our emphasis on the family-centered casework approach.

In geriatrics, we are no longer limiting ourselves to custodial care. Our institutions are on the march, improving their services to aging people. More and more we hear of the development of multiple-services of our institutions, and more and more do we hear of the development of community projects dealing with the interests of the aging. We are interested in maintaining the whole of man to the highest degree of productivity, no matter at what age level. Old age is no longer a period of vegetation. It has the potential of a positive force in our community life. We want this potential to grow into reality.

Within the last few years, we have seen the development of neighborhood councils. It is interesting to note that this aspect of strengthening family ties and family living within a given community has brought about splendid results, both in the spiritual levels of brotherly love and in natural gains made through united and common human efforts. Marching arm in arm, and shoulder to shoulder, irrespective of race, color or religion, families have bound themselves together in a community unit in order to bring about better housing, better living standards, and a better philosophy of life.

Were I to be asked in which areas of social welfare our National

Conference is projecting its greatest interest at the present time, the answer would be difficult. There is no segment of human suffering or problem in which we are not concerned. All human problems are our business, just as they were the business of Our Lord. Yet, in a specific manner, there are three areas which stand out. In the area of the care of the aging, our Sisterhoods and Catholic Charities have made positive contributions by giving better service to their constituents and employing the best techniques possible. In the development of these techniques they have not lost the spiritual motivation of their services. Let us keep on developing these programs under private auspices, both in our institutions, and in our communities. Possibly our parishes could receive more encouragement to organize community projects for the aging within the parish structure.

In the area of community development, we have gained a deeper insight into the involvements which strengthen our neighborly living. We have learned to become interested in community problems, since they affect every family in the neighborhood. This kind of cooperation can help many parishes with their financial investments, and more than that, can strengthen our communities, families and individuals.

The third phase is our continuing and deepening concern for the development of trained staff workers. With this goes a great effort to enlist the help and participation of our lay people in the Catholic Action movement. Happily, we are giving greater responsibility to the volunteers on our staffs. This is both a healthy and a valuable recognition of the layman's role in the activities of the Church.

As I stand before you, I feel as proud of the National Conference of Catholic Charities as all of the delegates and visitors. It is an organization that has been founded to promote love for mankind. It is attempting to fulfill the mission of Christ through a personal approach, as well as a community approach.

Catholic Charities, as in the past, and now, shall in the future, continue to build faith in God, and in mankind. It shall strive to develop mutual esteem and confidence in all people served, for love knows no end but encompasses all humanity. As lay apostles, and as representatives of the Church and hierarchy, it is our obligation to preserve the traditions and the philosophy of Christ's

charity. Through direct contact with families in need, through active community participation, it is our objective to give vitality to earthly living and win hearts and souls to God.

AN EVALUATION AND REDEDICATION

George E. Heneghan
President, Superior Council of the United States, Society of St. Vincent de Paul, St. Louis, Mo.

WE HAVE reached another milestone in our history. In this year of 1958 we are observing the 125th anniversary of the establishment of the Society of St. Vincent de Paul. You will recall its humble beginnings. A young man, not yet 20 years of age, deeply religious, found himself in the hostile, and, to some extent, atheistic environment of the Sorbonne University. Powerful intellectual forces derided and undermined the faith of many of the young. Under such circumstances, Frederic Ozanam and his several ardent companions sought means whereby they might both save themselves and vitalize their religious faith. They had no notion of a large and great organization; rather, the conviction that through an intimate neighborliness among themselves and through going out to the poor, they would, in some small measure, exemplify their Christian heritage of charity. But, as always, genuine love is infectious and it cannot be contained. Within a few years, in countless other cities throughout Europe, the formation of Conferences of the Society of St. Vincent de Paul had taken place. In 1845, only 12 years after the original foundation, the first Conference of the Society in the United States was established at the old Cathedral in St. Louis, Mo. The Society had become, and remains today, an international brotherhood whose object is the sanctification of its membership through neighborly service.

In this anniversary year, it is fitting that we evaluate our present position and rededicate ourselves to the works of God's mercy and love.

There are in the United States today approximately 3,500 Conferences, functioning usually in parishes. We are happy to note, however, that occasionally such units are associated with our Catholic universities, colleges and seminaries, and more recently, with some of our high schools. During the last fiscal year,

these Conferences expended approximately five million dollars in various forms of charitable service. They visited the distressed in their own homes; they were the comforting friends of the sick in hospitals and nursing homes; they were concerned about the imprisoned, the aged, the handicapped, about children, about families. In a real sense, we may say that no work of charity is foreign to the Society.

It is pertinent to note that the Society is a growing organization. During the past seven years, approximately 1,200 new parish Conferences were established in various parts of the United States. This achievement is, I believe, of particular significance, for it represents the power to attract men, to attract them when no tangible rewards are offered, but, rather, only sacrifice and dedicated living. The conclusion I suggest is that an organization like this meets an essential need of the human person. We do not want our lives to be merely mundane. We want and demand greater opportunities for loving and being loved. Nor are men satisfied with less than personal service and genuine responsibility in the work of charity. It seems to me also that so universal a need is not only a force to be nutured and preserved, but is, in fact, absolutely indispensable for the general good. It is not enough that men give money, they must also give of themselves. What was true in Ozanam's time is true also today. Ozanam spoke of the young men of Siena. "These young seigneurs ought to know what hunger and thirst and the destitution of a naked garret mean. They ought to see fellow creatures in misery, distress—sick children, little ones crying with hunger. They ought to see them that they may love them."

If a time should come when all the organized works of charity are entrusted to specialists, however competent, then the concern of society will no longer be the welfare of the distressed, but only how inexpensively can we get this job done. Most of us can talk with philosophical equanimity about the remote two-thirds of the world who are not sufficiently nourished, but the tearful little girl next door who has broken her doll will move us to compassion.

We see also in the work of volunteers and of voluntary agencies the preservation of liberties and the foundation and inspiration of Crusading Charity. Because they were working with distress and need, the Particular Council in Milwaukee was among the first to become aware of the harmful results in recent legislation regard-

ing residence requirements set up by the Wisconsin legislature. However unintended, the stringency of the enacted measures was reducing some to a virtual position of statelessness and eliminating them, when in need, from the customary forms of public assistance. The Vincentian Council, under the circumstances, did two things. It exercised its own resources to the utmost in sustaining such hapless families, and then it took the leadership in marshalling public opinion in order that such legal inequities might be eliminated. We have seen other instances, too, where because of its intimate familiarity with what was going on, the voluntary organization was able to arouse public opinion. In one large community, a movement was under way, under the guise of protective service, to set up dangerous patterns of family intervention, without any regard to appropriate legal action. It was only because of its own experiences over many years and its first-hand acquaintance with such situations, that the Society, through its leadership, was able to point out the potential harm that was present in such a new arrangement and aroused community opposition to this kind of misguided enterprise.

We recall also the vital role which the voluntary organization and its members may have in meeting some of the most serious problems of our times. In Philadelphia, the members of the Society, with little publicity, have cooperated with the juvenile authorities in their work with delinquent and pre-delinquent youth. As neighbors, they have been especially helpful in assisting the troubled boy from the fatherless home. We see in this undertaking the kind of fundamental cooperation which is necessary in order that the work of the expert may have a meaning. However important may be that expert help, the fact remains that the person—in this case, the disturbed boy—will most often continue to live in the community, and unless there are complementary forces in that environment which will assist and re-enforce, then the work of professional service has little chance to succeed.

In our work we are becoming more and more aware of the meaning of neighborliness and of the need for a universal neighborliness. During the depression years and earlier, we were always conscious of poverty; and perhaps almost inevitably, both because of the numbers involved and the need for efficiency, we were inclined to segregate people into "haves" and "have-nots," and we were not sufficiently concerned with the whole man, his

feelings, his dignity and his status as a contributing member in society. As the President of the Council-General once remarked, "If there were any word in our Rule to be changed, it is the word 'poor,' or rather the archaic meaning given to it." It seems to exercise over our imagination a kind of destructive attraction. And that unfortunate fact for too many years led us to forget that the "poor" of which our Rule speaks, refers not only to those whose wants are material, but in a sense to all of us. We are all poor in that we have not measured up to our potential. We are poor, too, because no human life is without its failures and distresses. To assuage this universal poverty are the direct love of God and the love of neighbor for neighbor, based upon the love of God. As we have been able in these relatively "good times" to think through more carefully these universal needs, we see somewhat more clearly the equal dignity of all men and the part which universal neighborly Christian service has in the Providential plan. We are more aware of our need, not just to give to another, but also to take from him showing a wholesome willingness to learn from him as well as to help teach him.

There is very wholesome evidence of this in our relationship with the aged and the blind. Because we are learning to control the tendency to take over and to act as if they were totally helpless and incompetent, we do not rush in to remove them from the community and place them in some "nice" home. And because we are beginning to have some appreciation of their capacity, we also appreciate the personal contribution which they can make to our own lives. In speaking with one Vincentian recently, he recalled his first visit to the home of a somewhat enfeebled, elderly woman. He frankly acknowledged that his first thought had been the demands which her dependence would place upon him. He had in mind to encourage her to seek admission to an old folks' home. But he quickly discovered that she had no such intentions herself, and he prudently decided to bide his time. He has been biding his time for several years and he expects to do so for many more. Because, as he has come to know his elderly neighbor, he has also appreciated her great heart and stamina, her desire for her home and independence. I think, however, that the most wonderful facet in this relationship is the visitor's own real delight and satisfaction in it. He likes this fine old lady and enjoys her company.

Through the continuing study that goes on in parish Conference meetings, and through such training methods as the Ozanam School of Charity, we are gradually reaching a degree of objectivity in our relationships with people. In other words, we are seeing handicaps and limitations, but we are also realizing that these do not necessarily exclude vital functioning in many areas. The vast majority of our people want to be independent, and have the capacity for intelligent self-government. What they essentially ask is the opportunity for maintaining themselves, together with some recognition of their human capacities and dignity. A universal Christian neighborly service, stressing "give and take" among men, is one of the important environmental factors in maintaining that individual freedom and strength.

Charity is for everybody. I say this with some particular sense of responsibility toward the young. You will recall that several months ago the *Catholic Charities Review* referred to the art work which had been produced by our Catholic children in connection with the Vatican City Exhibit at the Brussels World Fair. There was, however, one disturbing note in their depicting of charitable work. Their representations rather generally emphasized the role of the priest and the nun in alleviating distress. As a wonderful tribute in recognition of their ministrations, we can all be pleased; but one suspects that perhaps our youngsters are not sufficiently aware of their own personal participation in charity and of their obligations, not only to support, but also to perform. If such a failure exists, the responsibility is primarily ours. We have not given to our young men and women their rightful place as leaders and as followers in the cause of Christianity. Wise men have told us again and again that in our youth lies our hope. And there is no more convincing demonstration of that truth than Frederic Ozanam himself. Before the age of 25 he had put into motion a world-wide movement, and before his death at 40, his accomplishments in a wide variety of fields had won him an immortal reputation. Today, Ozanam, the servant of God, is on the threshold of canonization. We confidently pray that this servant will soon be raised to the honors of the altar, and that, in the day of his glory, and through his intercession, the hearts of young and old will be moved, and our homes and neighborhoods will become the sanctuaries of Christian charity.

If, in this anniversary year, we review with satisfaction the

accomplishments of the Society of St. Vincent de Paul, it is to give thanks to the Author of all inspiration and goodness—God Himself. And it is to recall the religious motivation of our Society and to demonstrate that men, for the sake of God and in His Name, can be privileged to serve as instruments of His Divine Providence. Without Him, we are as nothing, but through Him, we can become all things. We look to our heritage in order that we may be rededicated to the works of God's love and mercy. We recall the words of St. Pius X, as he spoke with us some 50 years ago: "In your works of benevolence always look for your inspiration to the Altar. Your charity ought not to be that of men, but of Christians who behold in the poor something sacred—not only the image but the very person of Our Lord Jesus Christ."

A WELCOME TO COLUMBUS

The Most Reverend Clarence G. Issenmann, S.T.D.
Bishop of Columbus

WE WELCOME you to Columbus, City and Diocese, for this 44th Annual Meeting of the National Conference of Catholic Charities and the St. Vincent de Paul Society.

You are met from every part of our country for serious deliberation. What you do here these days may not win headlines, but we are aware of the significance of this meeting, of your sincere effort to look at yourselves and your work honestly, and to measure yourself and your work frankly against the supernatural standard that must be the foundation of all love of fellow men. Any lower motive cannot be for us. Unless we are inspired by the love of God—by divine charity—all our charitable reaching out to assist our neighbor becomes a form of material philanthropy and officious bureaucracy.

"Charity and clarity in purpose, competence and compassion in practice" is the theme of this annual meeting Despite general considerations and specialized interests, you will miss the chief purpose of these days if you do not examine your own spiritual case history, with a view to a greater inspiration and renewed dedication of yourself to your place in Catholic charity work, measured by God's truth, law and grace.

When our love of others is the love of Our Lord for men,

we have a clear vision of what it means to help others and our efforts show a skill and zeal that bespeak the saints. That is precisely what we want and need—saintly leaders and workers in every form of charity in which the Church expresses her concern for men.

In God's providential design I am privileged to be your host Bishop in the place of Bishop Ready, of happy memory, who invited you to Columbus. In his spirit of gracious hospitality, the local committee of priests, Religious, lay men and women, under the direction of Monsignor Kappes and Monsignor Corcoran, have tried to anticipate anything that may distract you from giving undivided attention to the serious discussions of these days. We want the recollection of what you do here to be a profitable memory and a lasting inspiration to you in your dedicated charity to your fellow men.

SOME NEEDS IN AMERICAN SOCIAL WELFARE

The Honorable Arthur S. Flemming
Secretary, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
Washington, D. C.

IT IS a privilege and honor to have the opportunity of participating in the annual National Conference of Catholic Charities. I know of no group that is more dedicated to caring for the needs of our fellow men. As a nation we are indebted to you and to your organization for your vision and for your ability to apply your vision in a practical way to the needs of our day.

At the very heart of our Judeo-Christian tradition is the Commandment, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." This Commandment, it seems to me, places upon us a common responsibility —a responsibility which if accepted provides both a center and a direction for life.

But what is the nature of this responsibility? The Commandment does not require us to like our neighbor. It does not require us to approve everything that our neighbor says or does. The Commandment simply places upon us one obligation, namely, to take full advantage of every opportunity that is presented to us to help our neighbor realize his highest potential. This obligation

is a spiritual law of life—a law which, when disregarded wrecks the life of the law-breaker and helps to disrupt the society of which he is a part.

Therefore, it is with the conviction that each one of us must be participants and not spectators when it comes to dealing with the needs of our fellow human beings that I want to discuss with you two aspects of the nation's welfare program.

First of all, I believe that we must focus our attention to an even greater extent than we have in the past on the opportunities that are presented to us for serving the families of our nation that are in need of assistance. I know that I do not need to argue this point with you. You have reached this conclusion because of the experience that you have had. I have reached this conclusion because I respect your conclusions and the conclusions of your fellow workers in the welfare field, and because of what I have observed as a layman.

Of course, I have been impressed by reading that a study in St. Paul, Minn., brought to light the fact that about 6 per cent of the families in that city were absorbing over half of the welfare dollars of the community. And I have been even more impressed by the success which followed in the wake of the decision that was made to do something about these "sick" St. Paul families by launching a family-centered project which focused both the public and private resources of the community on the problem.

Here are some of the steps that it seems to me we can and should take in order to strengthen family-centered programs in the welfare field. We must make sure that our laws, rules and regulations facilitate rather than impede the family-centered approach.

A week ago a woman visited our public assistance office in Washington in order to talk about a family with which she was acquainted in a Western State. The father, afflicted with a lung ailment, can no longer work in the fields as he has always done, and as a result his family is receiving public assistance payments. He has discovered that he is eligible for training for office employment under the vocational rehabilitation program. But he has also discovered that if he undertakes this training, his family will be deprived of public assistance because of a ruling that if he is well enough to take job training, he is well enough to work. Here is a family that is trying to get back on its feet but is

blocked in its efforts because of a regulation that is in direct conflict with a family-centered program.

I am sure that many of you would tell me that the laws, rules and regulations, and possibly the organization structure of the Federal Government contribute to the difficulty. If you believe this to be the case, I hope that this Conference, as well as other organizations with which you are associated, will make specific recommendations to me designed to correct the situation. I can assure you that these recommendations will be given careful consideration.

If we agree with the recommendations, and changes in laws are required, we will make the necessary recommendations. If we agree with the recommendations and have it within our discretion to change the rules and regulations that need to be changed, then the rules and regulations will be changed. If we don't agree with the recommendations, we will tell you why we do not agree.

I can assure you, however, that my associates in the Department are not waiting to receive such recommendations in order to move into action. They believe in this objective on which we are concentrating our attention tonight, and I know that I will be receiving recommendations from them for assistance in eliminating roadblocks that stand in the way of those who are engaged in welfare activities serving the entire family in a coordinated and effective manner.

In addition to Federal roadblocks, however, I am sure that you know of State and local laws, rules and regulations that stand in the way of an effective family-centered approach to our welfare problems. I hope that you will not simply complain about these State and local roadblocks, but that you will enlist in a crusade designed to remove them.

This family-centered approach makes such good sense that there is no question in my mind but that we can bring about a modification of our laws, rules and regulations if we are willing to expend enough energy in the direction of achieving such a goal. We must engage in research and demonstration projects designed to improve our ability to render service to families. It is clear that we need additional research on the causes of family breakdowns, the steps that can be taken to eliminate these causes, and the most effective methods for dealing with the breakdowns once they occur.

The Congress, in amending the Social Security Act in 1956, recognized the need for research in these and other areas by authorizing funds for such projects. Up to the present time, however, no funds have been appropriated. Every effort will be made to have funds for this purpose made available during the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1959.

In addition, however, to whatever Federal funds may be made available, every effort should be made to earmark State and local funds for this purpose, and also to encourage individuals and foundations to make private funds available. I recognize that some work has been carried on already in this area. I believe, however, that we have only scratched the surface and that if we are willing to insist, in season and out of season, on the importance of additional research activities in this area, we will obtain additional significant support.

We must recruit and train a rapidly increasing number of professional personnel capable of providing public and private welfare groups in our communities with effective leadership, as we seek to place increasing emphasis on family-centered welfare programs. It is my understanding that every year, from 10,000 to 15,000 social workers are needed to fill current vacancies created by those retiring or leaving the field. And yet, I am informed that at the end of the 1958 academic year, only 1,600 newly qualified social workers entered this very important field of work.

It is also my understanding that during the academic year 1958, just a little over 4,000 students were enrolled in graduate schools of social work. This is a serious situation and one that must be corrected if we are to take full advantage of the opportunities for constructive service which confront our nation in the welfare area.

In the second place, I believe that we must concentrate, as my predecessor, the Honorable Marion B. Folsom, suggested in an address to this body in 1956, on "the serious lack of joint planning and coordination between public and private agencies."

There is no question at all in my mind but that if we are to have a sound social welfare program in this nation, we must strengthen the work of both private and public organizations. We must never permit ourselves to think in terms of either private organizations or public organizations or vice versa, but only in terms of both public and private organizations. Both have a tremendous role to play.

Within the private groups, I have deep personal convictions as to the absolute necessity of continuing and strengthening the work of our religious organizations in this field. They make a contribution that no other organization can make in terms of motivating men and women to travel the second mile in order to help their fellow human beings. In saying this I want to give full recognition to the fact that many persons associated with other private organizations and with public organizations also are traveling the second mile because they have been motivated by the faith and church of their choice to accept our common responsibility of loving our neighbors as ourselves.

At the same time I feel that we must frankly face the fact that, taking the nation as a whole, we have not done a good job of joint planning and coordination between public and private agencies. Undoubtedly a good deal of this type of planning and coordination should take place at the national and state level.

Personally I feel, however, that the most significant contributions in this direction must take place at the community level. I believe that Councils of Social Agencies or their counterparts must become the media for obtaining appreciation for our community welfare programs, and for the roles that are going to be played by private and public organizations in the interest of achieving these objectives. These roles may very well differ from one community to another. Our national policies must be flexible enough to permit us to adapt our rules to the special needs of each community.

The amendments to the Social Security Act of 1956, supplemented by the amendments of 1958, put the Federal Government in a position where it can, working through the States, be an active partner in local efforts in the field of planning and coordination. Congress has clearly established the fact that we are to be interested not only in assisting in the alleviation of need, but also in helping programs that are designed to prevent persons from being placed in a position where they require assistance. If there is anything about our administrative rules, regulations and practices that stands in the way of the maximum effectiveness of local planning and coordination activities, we want to know about it.

Up to now I have been concentrating on what we and others can do in order to deal effectively with the opportunities that confront us to help those who are in need. I want also to express the

conviction that those of us who participate in welfare programs, both in and out of Government, need to do so if we are to accept for our own lives the full implication of the Commandment, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."

In a High Holy Day message, the Jewish Theological Seminary of America has included this statement: "The occasional impulse toward goodness is not enough. To meet the challenge of a fulfilled life we must train ourselves *to the habit of goodness,* to the continuing act of goodness at every moment of choice we have." It is only as we take full advantage of our opportunities to serve that we discover that life's greatest satisfactions come to those who try, with God's help, to keep this Commandment at the center of their lives.

I believe that the future of our world depends to a considerable degree on our ability to persuade others to join the ranks of those who are willing to do something about meeting the needs of others. I have never talked with anyone who applied this Commandment to his own life who did not recognize the absolute necessity of our nation also adhering to this spiritual law of life. Persons who have discovered this law in their own lives know that if our nation is to find or save its life, it must be willing to lose it in dedicated and intelligent service in behalf of other peoples. Such persons will never cynically refer to mutual assistance programs as "give away programs." Such persons make a major contribution to the development of a public opinion that in turn will enable our nation to set in motion those spiritual forces which will ultimately provide us with a spiritual breakthrough, which in turn will lead us into a pathway of peace.

And so, as you seek to focus the attention of your Church, the community, the state and the nation, on programs that are designed to deal effectively with the welfare needs of our people, I hope that you will realize that in addition to dealing with these specific needs you are making a definite contribution to the attainment of the goal for which all of us fervently pray, namely, peace in our time.

MEETING THE CHALLENGE OF AN EXPLODING URBAN CIVILIZATION

ALBERT MAYER
Architect and Town Planner, New York, N. Y.

I AM particularly happy to have been asked to speak before your group. This is not just the usual amiable opening sentence to a speech.

I have as a matter of fact been reaching in my own development toward the stage of realization that the technical solutions, or the technical-administrative solutions, or the technical-administrative-economic solutions to urban life and urban development—which constitute as of now almost universally our total means of approach —are by no means enough. Alone, they cannot solve the problems of local living, local relationships, local change. I am convinced that there are human components lacking, and that these lacking components are those implicitly expressed in the title of your organization: the social or social work element, and the religious or ethical element.

On the other hand, you cannot fully accomplish your kind of work unless a better-interrelated, qualitatively and quantitatively more adequate physical frame is created.

It will probably become apparent to you that this talk may not be nearly as pin-pointed as it should be, because I do not know enough about how large is the diameter of the orbit within which Catholics may work. On the other hand, this may be an advantage. By painting an over-all picture I am not hampered or confined by knowledge—always a pleasant or "free and easy" situation. And if this over-all picture has relevance it may stir you more forcibly than if I were to try any pre-digesting. In any event, if the prospects seem both difficult and stirring, and the ideas get under your skin, you will transmute them into usable form.

There are four levels at which you must become aware and must take hold, to make the kind of contribution to urban development and urban living and community participation which is so desperately required at this time. While it is the fourth or last one which seems to me to be your ultimate contribution, I feel you must thoroughly grasp and enter into all the livels, if your ultimate contributions are to be made. Incidentally, when speaking of "contribution," we are definitely in these matters contributing

to others, yes; but fully as much to ourselves, because each of us is in the same frustrating situation. So we are really trying to help ourselves.

The levels to be identified and discussed are these:

The techno-creative level.

The research-and-observational level.

The social work-operational level, including Pilot Projects on various scales.

The crusading and self-purificational level.

Let us first identify and briefly discuss the situation we are talking about. It is the galloping deterioration of our rapidly growing urban areas, when we understand that by *urban* we now mean by far the greater part of our country's population, and that in our urban areas we will by 1975 be housing an *additional* 60 million people, i.e., almost all of the country's increase in population. In other words, the reason we must get excited about this is that for *urban* we can really substitute U.S.A.

What are the symptoms of galloping deterioration? The classical one is of course the slum, a really old and persistent and constantly increasing phenomenon—not decreasing mind you. Somewhat newer: the socially narrowing suburb, now itself in incipient decay, now more of a social waystation. The omnipresent traffic problem which each of you is painfully aware of—except to say that as it keeps getting worse, we still retain the naive expectation that the next $100 billion spent on roads and/or tunnels and/or parking garages, will cure it. The inadequacy of our present city government orbit to deal with deterioration, technically beyond its legal borders but in its destructive character, fully part of us. Possibly most fearful of all the symptoms: the social malaise and deterioration, the spiraling increase of mental illness, of juvenile delinquency, in quantity and in intensity. And most discouraging of all, if we could allow ourselves to be discouraged—which faith in life and in our mission cannot permit us to be—is the failure to gain on these problems, and indeed the fact that we are losing ground vis-a-vis them, in spite of vastly increased expenditures on many of the symptoms, though emphatically, not on all.

There is the situation, painted darkly but no darker than realism requires. If we are not to be discouraged, let us see what we should do and probably can do, if we place this group of problems high enough on our list of priorities. You will recall I spoke of

four levels of understanding and action. Let us now take them apart.

The Techno-Creative Level

There is a great deal of planning being done in the cities of this country, or it might be more accurate to say, a great deal of money and time spent on planning, and indeed on development too. This of itself must not suffice to satisfy you, for it is the quality of the planning that is really significant and you even as non-professionals can participate to improve that quality, by making certain demands of it. Urban planning in this country is not a creative or moulding or directional process, but a matter of discerning trends and following them, limited in its aims to conforming in a more orderly way with those trends, whether desirable or not; rather than attempting to re-shape them or direct them in new ways after having posed and considered major alternatives.

It is also, in large measure, a matter of looking back, of repairing errors, of patching up, of *re*developing—that eternally recurring prefix *re* is the giveaway—rather than looking forward, stirring things up now, taking measures for a new world, rather than always trying to catch up. As an example, we should now be looking forward to creative placement of vast new urban populations, immigrants and natural increase, alertly foreseeing and creatively directing at trivial cost, compared to the tremendous cost of rearguard re-planning. We are, for example, buying back spoiled slummed-up land to fix it up, at 10 or 20 times the cost of new land, which we could plan beautifully with new knowledge, with bitterly won experience. Remember that overwhelming fact of a 60-million population increase, verbally acknowledged because the demographers say so, but not part of our active planning.

Now here is another thing in our planning that you ought to know about, and do something about. It is what may be called the Nemesis of the single measure. Highways and thru-way and tunnels and cloverleaves and parking garages alone will not solve traffic, even if you spend billions of dollars; not if you do it alone, without taking the much more important measures in other fields, *at the same time* which will diminish the *need* for traffic by arranging functions and land use closer to home and to each other. Notice the modern theory and practice of flood control by reducing the

flow of water from upstream by afforestation, by plugging up the small gullies, rather than by just building bigger and even bigger levees or dikes downstream, trying vainly to take care of bigger and bigger floods. As an example of things upside down: when new turnpikes are built, engineers make predictions of traffic volume to justify bond issues. Then, when later on the predictions are exceeded, as they generally are, the engineers and bondholders are tickled to death. But you must remember that in a larger sense all it means is that new road facilities are not only taking care of traffic, but creating a lot of new traffic, which freshly crowds things up. Do you know, for example, that maps are now available in the New York region which show how to avoid the new and now crowded expressways?

Take another example. I was in San Francisco the other day. They had just opened a big new parking garage. To everyone's surprise, it was filled the day it opened, while usually it takes months; and, even more surprising, it was reported that other garages hadn't suffered—were filled up as usual. The headlines and news stories welcomed all this triumphantly. Actually, it was sad news, frustrating news. For it meant that, attracted by these new facilities, some 500 cars were added to the traffic stream that had not been there before, further cluttering up the streets.

Or, consider any other single measure. Urban redevelopment may revitalize 100 acres, but its displaced population may be creating and generally is creating serious problems for neighborhoods covering 10 times that area. But the planners or re-developers don't know about that, because their single-trackness has confined its attention to the first area. So, watch out for the single remedy. Actually, we have a lot of tools. If we synchronize and inter-relate our tools, our money and effort have a much better chance of accomplishing something positive, rather than doing something we've later got to undo or re-do.

In a way our planning follows single fashions, spectacular single planning headlines. We, the citizens, have got to see that we get plans that are really balanced, or that pose clear understandable alternatives. There are different types of plans and different items to be purchased for our money, depending on a clear statement of alternative objectives—which we so rarely get. Is our city and region better off to spend, say, $500 million on highways, or to spend half that on playgrouds, green areas, local community

facilities and operations that may give greater happiness, and by keeping people pleasurably where they are, minimize the load on highways, and hence reduce their cost? These matters are indeed interlinked, though they are rarely presented that way. These are the balanced alternatives that you must insist on, rather than accept the single spectacular expenditure that some energetic public official or automobile club is plugging.

As a last example on the techno-creative level: consider urban land policy. Both in order to determine the best arrangement of our cities, and to drastically cut down the cost of land when we do make our improvements, a number of the most frugal cities in Scandinavia and in Holland, which have no money to spare, have long since found that a policy of land purchase while land is cheap pays off in a big way. Here is another alternative we should be considering, for our over-all funds. Yet none of us has ever even heard this seriously suggested in an American city.

Please note that I'm not undertaking to make every man his own development expert, but to point out some characteristic defects which the public has got to grasp, and in which it must make itself felt if we are to steer a positive course in urban development. Assuming you agree with this analysis, you still need to devise a way to effectuate it, because of course not every man can himself be expected to recognize and interpret what is happening.

The Research-and-Observational Level

Not nearly enough is known as to the effects of what we are doing; and further, the time-lag is excessive between the activity-effect, and the observation-evaluation or research. If negative effects are to be minimized and positive effects maximized, we have got to know much more quickly what is happening and whether and how to modify our course. Your field workers, or your field workers reinforced by trained observers, could be of important help here. A few examples:

We are clearing vast areas, where millions of people live, to make way for urban redevelopment, for the new interstate highway system, for public buildings and public works. Generally the agency responsible for the work breathes a happy sign of relief when the displaced residents find any kind of shelter, wherever it may be. But nobody knows what the effect is on the people so moved, or on the neighborhoods on which they impinge. We are

thus piling up a big and ominous question mark. We may be and probably are causing unsuspected damage in five or ten areas, for every one we may be helping.

Also, we know that a very short time after a new Levittown or other large development is created, churches start flooding in to meet the need. But what happens to the church or other religiously-sponsored institutions when the neighborhood moves away, or so changes that only a fraction of the original constituency remains? I personally know of two fine examples, which happen not to be Catholic, where the institutions stayed on, accommodating program and services in the one case to a largely different religious and ethnic group; in another, to a predominantly colored group. How is this working? What other policies are being followed in other cases? What are the various experiences? What are the principles that should govern decision? Of course, each specific situation needs to have its own solution, but a body of current observation and experience is badly wanted.

Public housing is an example where observation-research took far too long to get started, and permitted tremendous social-moral damage to accumulate over a number of years before we finally began to grasp it and take some action. Originally conceived as better physical environment and brave new communities that would of themselves improve social conditions, we now find that the predicted drop in juvenile delinquency did not take place, and in fact there is often a rise. The break-up of old communities through clearance, the formation of huge new housing enclaves have neither the old cement of existing communities, nor the positive cohesion dynamics to form new ones. Several recent studies, as for example by Elizabeth Wood and Ellen Lowrie, point up these conditions. But instead of coming so many years after the fact, I want to plead with organizations like yours to watch these developments alertly, so that we can salvage and enhance the good elements and warn when the neglect or the damage begins to be visible, before it takes a poisonous hold.

Perhaps you already have systematic field workers and trained observers or researchers recording and interpreting such developments as the three just cited, fairly soon after the fact. If not, it seems that our very fluid urban scene demands this fruitful observation and evaluation, without waiting too long.

The Social Work-Operational Level or the Pilot Project Level

There are many points at which research-evaluation shows the need for field work to be done, often of the operational or social work type, as it has now become apparent that it is necessary to supplement or properly implement the new physical creation. I have already cited the ills of public housing which requires a good deal of experimental operational work of various alternatives to see what produces the best results and at what comparative costs, which is of course always an important element. The Lavanburg Foundation has undertaken several methods for comparison in New York City. But in order not to lose more time, and to make up for lost time if possible, there is no doubt that such Pilot efforts should be initiated in other types of cities and situations.

There is, also, room and great need for new kinds of social field projects that can no longer be called new or Pilot, because they have recently been done in various places, where many untouched neighborhoods remain to be handled and in many cities, where there still remain a number of facets not sufficiently proved out. I will cite only one, and for once it is an encouraging development, I am delighted to be able to say. There is a large amount of urban renewal going on around the country, a good deal of it in the particular form of rehabilitation of existing buildings instead of total clearance. It has been found that this appeals to local people —owners, tenants, neighborhood groups—and that close contact with them helps assure action and understanding. But it has already shown promise of going beyond that. On the basis of reports and case histories by Mel Ravitz, Professor of Sociology at Wayne University, describing his Detroit experience, Dan Carpenter of Hudson Guild in New York, and the Germantown Settlement in the Morton Neighborhood in Philadelphia, it has been found that the results not only have been positive in terms of the rehabilitation effort, but have, block by block, replaced the usual ordinary urban citizen's inertness and disengagement, by a new interest, a new role of active participation. This may be transcending the specific objective, and may well turn out to be more of the nature of over-all personal stake and interest such as characterized a smaller, earlier, simpler village and urban setting in this country. It may indeed be giving the ordinary citizen a real sense of validity

and of personal commitment. It is too early to say, yet, whether this is going to be permanently built in, and there are a great many uncertain factors not yet proved out. But it is not too early to commend this form of activity to your attention, both as an operational piece of work in the innumerable places where it has not been tried, and as a Pilot Project in the sense that there are still many questions to be explored.

These two cases of Pilot and near-Pilot projects, go into social and human aspects, which there is no doubt has been the missing component in our great physical undertakings.

The ones just noted are on a close, intimate micro-scale. There is one great Pilot urban project, on a vast scale, but necessarily put together from micro-elements, which is today's challenge. At this point, I would like your indulgence in plagiarizing myself, i.e., quoting from another talk of mine:

"There is one over-all plane of theory and of work where the city planner and our cities need help. If this is not forthcoming from the research sociologists, the action sociologists and the social workers, our city planning and city development is going to be negative and self-defeating or anarchic, humanly frustrating.

"In the building of new cities, and in the rebuilding of our existing cities, which is what city planning aims at, what are we going to do about the inter-racial problem? As urban redevelopment and other displacing operations take place, will the minorities continue to be kicked around, and end up in further overcrowding the few areas where they already are, or will their movements just blight and slumify what we call the middle-aged neighborhoods? One grave danger in the present accent on specific projects of urban redevelopment and urban conservation is that relocation means sort of sweeping people under the carpet, and, probably, producing negative effects on those being re-located and on the neighborhoods into which they find themselves decanted, which may more than nullify the positive effects on the areas being improved. There is some evidence on the positive, the creative side, that inter-racial living can work all right, and that not only in areas where they have lived together for generations, but in situations of present mobility and transition. For instance, in the study just published by the New York City Planning Commission on the West Side Urban Renewal there is this statement: 'While there is fear and suspicion of Puerto Ricans in some quarters in the study area, it would be

misleading to suggest that this is the predominant attitude. In churches, parents' associations, block associations, and civic groups, Puerto Rican and non-Puerto Rican neighborhoods have come to know and understand each other by working together to achieve common goals. . . .' How much of a creative over-all implication or structure is there in this?

"Now: The QUESTION. Can there be in some Pilot City, a large city-wide Pilot effort which would take some years, of the following nature: The research sociologists and anthropologists might be able to diagnose the roots and the manifestations of racial unfriendliness, and make recommendations about it.

"Perhaps the action sociologists and the social workers and religious groups could organize and energize a large experimental campaign in this Pilot City and see what could be done, whether the whole city could be lined up on the side of the angles, whether at least a good climate could be built up, within which carefully planned specific moves and movements would have a reasonable chance of success. Perhaps this is a naive suggestion, perhaps no city is ready for it, perhaps sleeping dogs must be left lying. But unless we crack this one, we won't crack really creative city development. . . . Or, if what I have outlined is too ambitious and may be counted on possibly to raise fears and antagonisms or re-create them, could you people do this on the scale of Pilot Neighborhoods, tackle a specific job in certain chosen neighborhoods, into which people are being decanted, such as is now being done in the active-improvement neighborhoods, do it enough ahead of time so as to prepare or create a climate, rather than apply a social fire-hose later, or try to."

And now, this leads naturally into the final section of this talk:

The Crusading and Self-Purification Level

This is certainly the most difficult of all for me, because this is the first time I have ever tried to crystallize and spell it out, and because it's on the moral level, on which you are a great deal more at home and entitled to think and talk, than I am. The only reason or excuse for "carrying coals to Newcastle" is that the issue has occurred to me so very strongly lately that it seems like a discovery, and perhaps this particular application may not have occurred to you.

But I would now hazard the idea that urban development re-

quires not only the techno-creative aspect which has been always well recognized, and the added dimensions of the micro- and macro-operational and social work aspects which have been sketched in, and also an infusion of crusading zeal to carry it all forward, but may above all require that moral fire that has not been considered so closely linked. And here I am referring not only to the crusading fire which drives one to work for a cause, to work principally on others, but the moral fire of self-purification, the lack of which may be at the bottom of some of the failures of urban development. To translate what I am trying to talk about, by use of an example. Most of us believe in non-segregation. But why is there the irresistible march to the suburbs? Of course it was the motor car that made it possible. But there are other physical locations and configurations that might work out as well as or better than the present suburbs. To my mind the basic motivation is the impulse toward various levels of segregation: economic, color-wise, possibly religious; and the urge toward the one-class, excessively homogeneous community. And this is now accounting for the incipiently discernible move *out* of the suburbs to areas beyond. The quite recent ex-suburb of Great Neck near New York is now being moved out of, as the community is becoming more filled and more heterogeneous. This well-recognized urge often appears, and is self-presented—and indeed validly so—on the basis of better schools, safer environment for the children. These are comfortable and satisfying reasons, and in one way or another we all are motivated by them.

But I want to present for your consideration and for mine, another kind of satisfaction. Who are the heroes of our time in this country? I personally have identified them in the photographs of frightened, brave little Negro children going to school in Tennessee, and their equally brave parents deliberately taking physical and psychological risk for themselves and their children to achieve something paramountly vital. It is they who by individual courage and determination are building a tremendous individual and corporate tradition to which they and their succeeding generations can look with a feeling of respect and honor and solidarity. One hears it said that the children are irreparably damaged psychologically by their experience. Maybe not. Maybe they are strengthened by the ordeal and their understanding of what is involved.

What I am venturing to suggest, is the opportunity to embrace

this same difficult choice, to abandon the implicit tenents of the suburban view, whether we have actually moved to the suburbs or not, to take some personal and family chances, so that we are not just researching and crusading and working on others, but making a modest but very vital and personally decisive contribution ourselves, joining in the stream of a better future, and cumulatively, who knows, up-winging that future and bringing it nearer by our will to create it.

I have here tried to present a brief working analysis or set of indications on four levels that as individuals and as a group you may choose to visualize and explore for future effectiveness. All four levels must be fully developed and deployed for real accomplishment. Of course this is all only suggestive, for you to explore and fructify. I do hope it is at least provocative. You will naturally do the real work to give it meaning, and make allowances where it says the obvious or is ill-explored.

Just after this talk had been typed, I came upon some very relevant and encouraging reports in the August-September 1958 issue of *Trends in Housing**. They are so heart-warming as important beginnings that they are worthwhile adding to the original manuscript and including in my talk. These concern citizens' movements called "signing campaigns" which give personal adherence and dedication, and seek to gain from others adherence for "open occupancy." There is the statement of the 26th National Catholic Family Life Convention held in Buffalo, 1958. But even more significant, are actions on the local plane, involving the people themselves. I will note two of the early ones.

"In early 1956, a group of fifty citizens of the adjoining towns of Champaign and Urbana, Ill., spent three months planning a project which became known as 'The Open Letter' on integration. This was a simple statement of belief in employment-on-merit and non-discrimination in housing.

"On Palm Sunday of that year, residents of the area were offered copies of the open letter in 23 churches in the twin cities, and were requested to secure signatures. . . .

". . . In less than a month, 1,455 persons had gone on the record pledging their support of integration, and the statement and names appeared in a full-page advertisement in two local newspapers.

---

* Published by National Committee Against Discrimination in Housing, 35 West 42nd Street, New York, N. Y.

"Advances which followed the open letter campaign: Election of a Negro to the Champaign school board, the beginning of integration in the school systems of both towns, new employment opportunities for Negroes, some openings in housing, and a general improvement in public opinion.

"More recently the Palo Alto Area Committee for Open Housing added 'research, education, and implementation' to its campaign of securing individual signatures to a covenant supporting integrated housing. Here is the pledge:

" 'Whereas our churches and other institutions of our society have repeatedly declared that all persons are children of God and are therefore to be treated as equals under God,

" 'Whereas this nation is built upon a heritage of equal opportunity, and

" 'Whereas this democratic principle is often denied in practice by discrimination against minority persons in housing,

" 'Therefore, I, the undersigned, desiring to offer concrete evidence of my conviction, hereby declare my intention to support in my community the policy of open housing.

" 'I hereby bear witness that I am ready to welcome into my neighborhood residents of whatever race, creed or national origin.'

"In December 1957, an exploratory meeting attended by clergymen and lay persons recommended the initiation of a 'project sponsored by local churches and allied groups involving research, education and the securing of individual commitments to the principle of open housing.'

"The first public announcement of the project came on Race Relations Sunday in early 1958, when ministers stressed open occupancy housing in their sermons, and mentioned that members would soon be given the opportunity to sign covenant cards.

"On May 10, barely five months after the PAACOH was organized, more than 1,500 signatures (out of a population of 48,000) were published as an advertisement in the Palo Alto *Times*."

COMPETENCE IN CHARITY

Dudley L. Baker

Executive Secretary Superior Council of the United States, Society of St. Vincent de Paul, St. Louis, Mo.

IT is said that a great lady—a profound intellectual in her own age and a canonized saint in ours—was wont to emphasize the part which qualified guidance had in cultivating one's spiritual life. A colleague was puzzled and somewhat unhappy about this insistence and inevitably the question was raised: If one must choose between a holy confessor with little learning and a well-grounded theologian with little piety, how ought one to choose? The saint reportedly answered in this way: "The consequences of sin are tragic and personal, but the consequences of ignorant leadership are tragic and diffuse. This priest's worldliness will harm him; the other's ignorance may harm me." With the practicality so characteristic of the pious, this great and learned lady insisted upon competence in those who would guide and counsel others.

And it was only last fall that similar convictions were voiced by a contemporary world leader. To the Second World Congress of the Lay Apostolate, the Holy Father addressed these words:

> Lay apostles will therefore always form an elite, not because they stand apart from the others but, much to the contrary, because they are capable of attracting and influencing others. We thus understand that they must possess, besides the apostolic spirit which animates them, a quality without which they would do more harm than good—tact.
>
> In order to acquire the necessary competence, it is evident that one accept the necessity of making the effort of attaining a serious formation: such a formation, the necessity of which for teachers no one doubts, is equally a necessity for every lay apostle, and we have learned with pleasure that the meeting at Kisubi emphatically stressed intellectual formation.

The Holy Father speaks in a general way of the lay apostolate, but the extension of his remarks to those engaged in the charitable activities of the Church is certainly implied. One of the major discussion sections in this particular Congress was directly concerned with the work of our Catholic charitable organizations.

To say that we stand for competence in charity may seem to

be on the same plane as saying we believe in goodness. There is no room for disagreement. But there may be room for an enervating prejudice. Because love is so elemental, necessary and universal, we are all, to some extent, experienced and experts. Now it is difficult to be objective about self when such fundamental personal realities are involved. Because life is unbearable without loving and being loved, I like to imagine myself as adequate in these essentials. And a stubborn resistance, namely, *as I am is quite good enough for helping others* may result. Besides, in a romantic concept of love, we conceive it as some magical entity, sweeping, abandoned, spontaneous. Competence, on the other hand, will connote calculation, study, deliberation and discipline. When all such feelings and attitudes and partial realities have been taken into account, the conclusion, however, remains inescapable. Love is delight and joy, but it is also sacrifice and hard work, and requires the diligent application of human faculties; love is application to study, a scientific interest in new findings and an up-to-date use of best modern means. The physician, for example, who would today be ignorant of wonder-drugs, would represent neither Christian charity nor justice, however well-disposed his feelings were toward the other members of the human race.

It should be added that there is a note of special urgency in the Holy Father's message to the lay apostolate. He significantly refers to the unequivocal struggle of the Church against the forces of atheistic Communism. He affirms that this is a warfare to the end, but that ours are the weapons of Christ. The weapons of Christ—there is no question about these—are centered in Christian love. Christian love can never be reconciled with mediocrity. The serious Christian formation upon which the Holy Father insists cannot be divorced from dedicated study, which is the price, indeed, of every competence.

Consider the concept of competence in relation to volunteer services. We have good reason for reassurance. In the first place, there are no people in the world who are more interested in and read more about human behavior than our own. Every newspaper, every diocesan publication and practically every reputable magazine devotes considerable space—usually of a worthwhile and informed caliber—to home, marriage, the care of the young, personal problems and family needs. Moreover, questions about motivation in human behavior are the study of many—the educator,

the merchant, labor and management. In one way or another, we are all studying ourselves. When one also takes into account that the Christian man, who practices his Faith, may bring to all the affairs of life, a heart schooled in ideals of love and sanctified by grace, then only the timid may deny the full part in competent neighborly service which the Christian man and woman ought to have.

Such optimism does not justify fool-hardiness. A little learning is a dangerous thing, has application when a would-be helper plunges in with no notion of his limitations and only haphazard vagueness about what he is dealing with and how it should be treated. In order that aimless and even harmful effort be not exercised, today's volunteers and voluntary organizations are, and in a general way, should be incorporating training programs and supervisory controls in their activities. It is, in fact, difficult to see how volunteers can maintain ideals of Christian service when they do not, through human means as well as Divine, seek the adequate formation of which the Holy Father has spoken.

We have been making further progress in seeking to achieve this formation. For example, the Ozanam School of Charity was established a number of years ago by the Particular Council of San Francisco, Society of St. Vincent de Paul. Their pioneering has led to the establishment of such schools elsewhere in the United States and has attracted the attention of Vincentians in other countries. It is especially gratifying to note that regular re-evaluation and review have characterized the work of these first schools. This means that they have a vital and dynamic quality, and a determination to move with times and needs and the modern world.

Such schools have been especially useful in dispelling false notions about charity, and in instilling a keener appreciation of the sensitivity which personal service entails. Organization in traditional volunteer work may have tended, in some artificial way, to separate giver and receiver. The mutual "give and take" of dignified Christian neighbors becomes more difficult to achieve when organized forces of charity enter the picture. I remember very well the words of an elderly woman who was being financially assisted by an organization of parish volunteers. In commenting on a recent visit, she said, "Mr. So and So seemed so tired and worried when he called today. I wanted to ask about what was troubling him and maybe try to cheer him up. But, of course, I

didn't." As if because she was being helped by an organized group, she had no right to give to its representatives. One Vincentian recently highlighted this very point, stressing the work of volunteers as genuine neighbors. "Ozanam would quarrel with anyone who claimed to be helping the poor, for helping between relations is not the one giving and the other taking. You help the poor and are helped by them. It would be simple to say you help the poor materially and they help you spiritually and it would also be wrong. That would be untrue, patronizing and destructive of relationship."

Training programs are helping to bring all of us back to more genuine notions of neighborly service. It may also be expected that they will discover new areas of service in which the practice of neighborliness is most naturally and effectively promoted. This neighborliness will be in the sharing and working together for the sake of common goals. No one has more convincingly and continuously pointed the way than the Secretary of the National Conference of Catholic Charities. Msgr. O'Grady's emphasis on neighborly self-help projects, his belief in people and their capacities, his convictions about developing indigenous leadership are a clear challenge to organized volunteer groups. There are few problems more pressing in American society today than the continuing decay of urban communities, to which there is no answer save the people themselves. The solution of these problems cannot be other than a common undertaking, one especially related to the practice of neighborly virtues and the work of voluntary neighborhood organizations. The role of the good neighbor is a responsible one.

Today's professional social worker is expected to be many things. She should possess a wealth of psychiatric information, have a general knowledge of physical illness and its personal and family consequences, be well grounded in home economics, nutrition, family budgetary problems, be able to serve in marriage counseling and child guidance roles, be a sociologist, an economist, be versed in certain phases of the law, know community resources and cultural and neighborhood forces, be a crusader in social welfare movements, be able to improvise resources in the face of community apathy, be involved in agency research, available to community groups as a speaker and maintain a high quality of literacy in recording and writing. But she is not the final word in any one of these specialties and lacks the prestige and rewards associated with the individualized professions. However that may be,

she has a unique competence as a balancer and more than any other professional person is aware of the total man and total social forces. Here is a responsibility which certainly demands competence—almost nothing less than universal genius.

Social work has been most willing to learn from other disciplines and sources. The time may now be at hand for a more forceful independence and the chartering of new courses. We have been largely influenced by schools of behavior which gave a strong emphasis—in part, beneficial—to the emotional life of the human person. Unfortunately, these philosophies are also mechanistic, unbalanced and largely pathological. Catholic social workers have, of course, divorced themselves from these latter implications; but, in practice, our divorce may not have been so complete. In diagnosis and treatment an appraisal of a client's weakness is essential, but this seems easier and more conventional than discerning and directed toward developing those positive qualities that give hope for progress and change. Even the words which we employ—oral, anal, compulsive—although subject to positive interpretations, conjure up more frequently the negative qualities of the people with whom we treat. In terms of our own convictions about the sublime destiny of man and our knowledge that God provides abundantly in order that every man may reach that glory, our philosophy is one of confidence and our competence ought not to be divorced from that philosophy. Some of the practical consequences of a competent, confident approach, one that is more concerned about recognizing and encouraging the strengths in men, may be: intensive study about helping processes which involve limited interviews; a greater cultivation in developing and collaborating with stable community agencies, such as school and parish; utilizing the services of volunteer agencies in a greater and more effective degree; and a more realistic appraisal of our own limitations. Several years ago, a highly stimulating psychiatrist told of an experience in his own community. It had become impossible for the clinic with which he was associated to serve all who applied and it was finally arranged that the clinic would accept only referrals from social agencies. When a person called the clinic, however, a record was kept of his identity and he was referred to one of the several social agencies in the city with the assurance that psychiatric service would be made available should this decision be reached by the social agency. One year later, the procedure was reviewed.

Clearances revealed that a relatively small proportion of the original callers had contacted any social agency. The clinic decided upon a follow-up. When these families were telephoned, the usual reaction was a rather vague recalling about the troubles of one year ago. "Yes, we were having some troubles, I think, about that time. But we managed and everything turned out quite all right. We are getting along rather nicely." Incidentally, I should mention the psychiatrist's rather facetious acknowledgment: "Of course, if we had had any contact at all with the families, we could have taken some credit for their rehabilitation." To return to his real point; namely, the rather astonishing constitution with which most of us are endowed to meet the difficulties and reverses of life. It is true that the needs of reality should determine the help that is given in any individual case. No principle about confidence ought to change that. But it is also true that principles based upon pessimism have no intrinsic right to prevail. We have leaned, it seems to me, in this direction.

One other consideration. Caseworkers in any agency should be expected to function primarily as professional practitioners in their own field of competence. In its concern about the total man, however, social casework, comes close to the work of other specialists and is concerned with the many facets of a human being's life. But man is first and foremost a religious person, a creature with moral rights and responsibilities. Now in keeping with its desire to help a person really grow through self-choice and self-responsibility, agency workers have been careful in discussing religion so that the client may not feel religiously coerced in connection with a specific request for other kinds of help. It may be wondered, however, whether we social workers, as a group, have achieved a mature and objective attitude about religious reality. We do not usually have considerable difficulty about discussing resources and values (other than religious) that are related to the client's welfare; for example, we can talk comfortably about such things as medical and psychiatric care. We respect the client's right to choose in these matters; but, unless the circumstances are highly unusual, we, at least, suggest and discuss the opportunities and give the client the chance to accept or reject. As social workers –particularly, I would think as Catholic social workers who know religious reality—we face a significant challenge to

our competence; to wit, the integration of our practice so that it may be accommodated to man's needs as a religious person.

Our Holy Father pleads for a competent charity; he also epitomizes in his own life the extent and quality of that competence. Charity is, first of all, for every person and places demands upon all, within varying degrees, for a high standard of performance. Now in his 83rd year, the Holy Father's life is characterized by tireless and exhausting activity. By that example he portrays that one's commitment to service is life-long. The story is told of his introduction to an aged and venerable clergyman whose many achievements were being reported to the Holy Father. These, the Sovereign Pontiff graciously acknowledged; but only to add "What is he doing now?"

Charity cherishes and encourages human skills and ingenuity. Pope Pius XII likes to travel fast. And he is said to chide his chauffeur when the auto trip to Castelgandolfo is not under 19 minutes. For, as he points out, the Church must make good use of and keep pace with the times, turning to God's good use all the wonders of nature and the inventiveness of men.

And, finally, Christian charity incorporates a unique competence for it is only through the knowledge of faith that we can always move to hope and to love. It was not long ago that a mother and child came to Rome seeking a private audience with the Holy Father. The child was horribly deformed and observers were invariably sickened by his pitiful and repulsive abnormality. The request for such a private audience was, after the manner of procedure, denied, but the request did come to the attention of the Sovereign Pontiff. Upon hearing of the circumstances, he brought an immediate halt to all papal audiences and refused to continue until the mother and child had been seen. Later when the Holy Father came into the room where they were waiting and saw this human grotesqueness, he reached out and took the boy into his arms and clasped him to his person. He said simply to him and to his mother, "God loves you." Like the Holy Father, the Christian may discern in the little boy Divine Beauty, scarred and drained of physical loveliness by a Cross. He is drawn to the child and embraces with deep compassion this small and somewhat misshapen temple of the Holy Ghost.

AMERICA AND THE PROBLEMS OF INTOLERANCE

Commissioner Charles Abrams,
Chairman, New York State Commission Against Discrimination, New York, N. Y.

IN the last six years, I have served the United Nations on various missions in Africa, Europe and Asia, and what has impressed me as underestimated has been the increasing ascendancy of intolerance throughout the world.

Almost every country I have visited or studied has a minority problem which is giving vent to some measure of ferment—religious intolerance in Pakistan and India which cost more than six million lives less than a decade ago; political intolerance which has wiped out millions in Russia and continues unabated; intolerance against refugee nationals which has cut off whole ethnic groups from their homes and livelihoods; color intolerance against blacks in South Africa and against whites in parts of Africa; intolerance against in-migrant Chinese and Japanese because they are successful, and intolerance against people from the provinces because they are not.

The anti-Negro violence in England is the most recent manifestation of the surging tide. Here a nation of 51 million people now finds itself unable to cope with an immigration of only 130,000 blacks. The mother of the Common Law whose principles of equity have at least for the last two hundred years, stood as an example and inspiration to civilized society, finds herself cringing under a burden which, numerically, should have been insignificant compared to our own problem. But the very fact that it has happened in England should make us pause and view the problem of intolerance as more than one of the South or of South Africa. It should also make us review our own place in the universal scene and the part we must play in the looming battle for the preservation of human dignity in the world in which indignity is becoming the prevailing form.

More and more it seems to me as likely that the crucial front on which the issue of 20th century morality will have to be fought is in America. The United States, of course, has not been immune from the sting of bigotry and it came with the very first flow of immigration into our borders. It took as many forms

as it is taking today elsewhere—religious intolerance against Catholics through the Alien and Sedition Laws, again in 1850 with Know-Nothingism, and again in 1915 with the Ku Klux Klan. There were anti-Semitic intolerance and nativism and the color intolerance which we still are facing today. But the fundamental good sense of the American people and their institutions have survived. The underlying ethic always scored against the tests and tensions of bigotry.

Yet the situation is far from secure today here or in the world. The free world and America in the last two decades have been riding the post-war wave of tolerance that surged in the wake of Hitler's demise. All the advances—the pronouncements of post-war treaties, the United Nations Charter, the numerous State civil rights laws, President Truman's Report on Civil Rights, and the Supreme Court decisions on desegregation were all dividends of a war into which a great ideal had been happily sculptured. When the war ended, it was written into the U.N. Charter where it can still be read. But with time and tension, grim realities have supervened; the ideals are fading and the air is filling again with the smell of bile and bitterness. It is best, therefore, that we take stock of the emerging situation in its new, tormenting context.

The most influential factors which have precipitated hostility between groups here and elsewhere are the by-products of a series of events, some of recent origin, some older. These are:

The elimination of disease and the extension of life which have spiralled the greatest population upsurge in world history—the largest population growth has been among the very groups who are the victims of bigotry; the imposition of rigid immigration restrictions which have bottled up their escape from oppression, hunger, or fear and confined them within national boundaries.

The increase of industrialization and urbanization which is bringing an ever-growing number of minorities and hinterlanders into the cities where they confront assimilated populations, challenge their social status, their housing, their jobs and their established neighborhood associations.

As long as the borders of the United States were open and and expanding, we received the oppressed, gave them haven and shared with them the fruits of our freedom. The frontiers of

Canada and South America also helped absorb them. But with the curtailment of immigration, the battlefront has veered to the internal areas of the nations themselves.

On the one hand, rural poverty and industrial expansion are directing an ever-growing flow of population toward the city centers. In the United States the new workers are no longer mainly immigrants but in-migrants. They are citizens from the South and Puerto Rico as well as Mexican aliens trekking across the Rio Grande. These three migrant groups differ from the Europeans in that many of them are more identifiable by color. The prejudice which had formerly manifested itself against aliens and religious groups is now showing itself mainly against citizens and against people different in color or background. The new minorities who moved into old neighborhoods have precipitated a mass exodus by the older urban residents. The increasing emphasis upon social conformity in American life has reinforced a new pattern of suburbanization dedicated to exclusion of these people. The minority movements have affected churches and religious institutions and altered their composition. While previous migrants were better able to move up in the social and economic milieu, more recent newcomers have found themselves stratified in social condition because of their higher visibility; many continued confined to meniality and depression. Absence of housing has impeded their free access to areas of opportunity and confined them to overcrowded conditions and slums, thereby stultifying their spiritual and emotional life and holding them to a more lasting desuetude. Absence of education at the source of the migration or language difficulties have accentuated their concentration in overcrowded sections and distorted their family institutions. Economic recession has borne down most heavily on them as evidenced by the fact that today more than twice the number of nonwhite workers are unemployed in the nation as are whites. Elsewhere too, the minorities are competing for jobs, are squatting in the city centers and challenging the old mores and established ways of the more settled groups.

For 160 years the United States has remained the great testing ground for assimilation, freedom and faith. Today there is cleavage. For the first time since the Civil War the Southern States have concerted their efforts to defy the law of the land and have in fact enacted State legislation to undermine the national morality

on equality of opportunity. Simultaneously, a new North has emerged which, having shed the roots of indifference acquired in the days of Reconstruction, has taken on the newer roots of post-war idealism. Today 12 States with populations of more than 90 million persons have enacted and reinforced laws to protect these minorities in their economic opportunities and have set up State agencies to assure them these protections. These States symbolize not only the new example of tolerance but the practical means for dealing with prejudice. These States are emerging as the symbol not only for America but for the world. While, therefore, we cannot close our eyes to the painfully difficult crisis in the South, we must also see that victory over Southern recalcitrance, as well as the survival of law over force, depend upon the continuance of that morality unimpaired in the North.

We are too prone however to feel insensible to the dangers. The cleavage has affected the security of our moral position. For one thing, within the Northern areas themselves, there is a growing group of citizens who feel themselves challenged by the minority movements into their neighborhoods. Legislators from suburban areas and from cities in which the minorities are not politically vocal are not only sympathetic with the Southern position, but are even yielding to the Southern Congressional bloc when it offers them support for their local projects in return for their support of Southern segregationism.

The larger cities which have been carrying the fight have in turn been unable to expand their boundaries as they did 50 years ago and are facing a vast increase in the proportions of their minority populations and a flight to the suburbs of their more prosperous elements. While this has brought a greater political emphasis on equality in the cities, it has not offset the anti-racial elements at the State or Congressional levels. The looming challenge in America is whether the rising tension in the suburbs and smaller cities will bring an alliance between Northern opportunism and Southern standpatism and thereby submerge the great ethical structure that has been building up in the industrial North since the war.

The church in America has been one of the great institutions affected by these changes. Minority movements into old neighborhoods and mass exodus into the suburbs have affected the investments of churches and religious institutions. But the church is also

the great bulwark of tolerance. It has traveled a long way since the day it felt it had no role in social progress and that its only mission was to rescue individual souls from the perishing world and save them for a spiritual life. Yet how rationalize the conflicts of its older members with its moral duties to the new neighbors? A few clergymen have openly opposed the newly arriving poor and have tried to rationalize the prejudice of their membership. In many other cases, an enlightened leadership has helped stem the senseless flight of the flock and brought about understanding between the old and new residents.

The question is moral and involves high principle. Yet there are also practical elements, which properly employed, can reinforce the principles. For a long period in history, churches sent forth their missionaries into other lands to convert people or to help and heal them. Today, the migrants pour into the areas where the churches are already established. Many of the churches, however, seem bewildered by the challenge. As long as the missionary could select the area where he could spread the faith, there was no problem. It was, in fact, looked upon as an opportunity. But when the people came to the areas of the established churches, some among them felt that the migrants threatened the churches and their membership. The bewilderment is understandable for the movements have taken many churches by surprise. In some cases Protestant churches have found themselves surrounded by Catholic migrants while Catholic institutions have found themselves engulfed by Protestants. But is the only answer the demountable basilica which must follow the flock wherever it flees? Or should the church accept the challenge and offer its charity, guidance, hope and help to those who need it most?

It is in large measure the religious leadership which must set the moral tone of the local and national communities and influence community attitudes and actions toward the higher aspirations. For the church is the true repository of the moral faith. And only by maintaining the Christian ethic high can the gains we have so far made in America be preserved. That opportunity can be met by an attitude which accepts each newcomer and which condemns prejudice and violation of law as an offense against religious precepts; by teaching existing residents that fear of people who are different is repugnant to reason; by giving cooperation to all who come regardless of their color; by joining with civic and

social groups of whatever denomination or composition in working toward common democratic objectives; by condemning violence against people who are different; by demonstrating that there can be progress in diversity; by espousing the thought that freedom of the individual and freedom of the church are indivisible; by acquiring the technique for tolerance as well as echoing the generalizations, and by applying those techniques; finally by supporting the Supreme Court when its rulings express the principles of human decency, for as Pope Leo XIII said, "The true liberty of human society does not consist in every man doing what he pleases . . . but that through the injunctions of the civil law, all may more easily conform to the prescriptions of the Eternal Law."

Above all, we must recognize that the struggle for equality in America is a struggle for equality throughout the world; that America has been and must continue to be the great laboratory in which the essential freedoms can win the test against bias. In giving leadership in each community, we can thereby give leadership to the country as a whole, which in turn will give courage to a troubled world in which political, social and economic intolerance is giving increasing offense to the human spirit.

PART II

REPORTS ON SECTIONAL MEETINGS

Integrated Day, September 19, 1958

SERVICE TO FAMILIES—THE FUNCTION OF VOLUNTARY AGENCIES

Chairman: Very Rev. Msgr. Joseph T. Lahart, *Director, Family Care Department, Catholic Charity Bureau, Chicago, Ill.*
Participant: Anthony K. Kaye, *Administrative Director of Casework, Catholic Charities of Buffalo.*

IN current social work literature, in social work education, and in many of the areas where social work is practiced, we say that our present American social work services can be traced to the English who recognized and accepted the principle of public responsibility for the needy. We say that current social services are a natural and logical outgrowth of the manner in which peoples attempted to meet needs, following the breakdown of individual charity (as practiced by the Church) to meet mass needs. Most of us will admit that certainly mass needs in the 14th through the 17th centuries were great and that the financial resources of the Religious from the then existing sources were strained and inadequate. On the other hand, however, we fail to recognize that along with the public acceptance of responsibility for the needy through public moneys there came also a basic change in philosophy toward the needy. Charity became not a family matter, that is, a means of helping a family, but there developed instead a "categorical" approach to charity. The family with children that could not be supported had the children's need met. In fact, later in the United States hundreds of families whose only problem was their inability to support their children, saw these children separated from them and in cattle-like fashion distributed at various whistle stop stations along railroad lines. We paid attention to the mentally ill, or the insane as they were called, not the family. We paid attention to the physically handicapped, or the cripple as he was called, not the family. A situation developed as a result which focused on the individual and his problem rather than on the problem the family was trying to face because an

atypical situation existed in their midst. It was inevitable therefore that a situation should have developed which resulted in a focus on the individual rather than the family. There was no question that this was responsible for the many "forgotten" patients in State hospitals, children in institutions and the aged in Homes. In a fashion, man forgot what the Church in its two thousand years of existence has constantly preached, that is, that the family is important and that it must be preserved. Some of this was also due to man's nature which makes it easy to fall for "fads." We, in many instances, tended to mistake fads for progress and it wasn't until some time later that we were rudely shocked into a true realization of the situation. We are now ready to re-examine social work practice in terms of our new understanding which actually is not new because many times in the past, and as recently as January 20th, 1958, the Pope spoke of (His) "lively interest in family life, of how we should never miss an opportunity to point out its many-sided dignity, to reassert its rights and defend them, to inculcate the duties involved. . ."

Our new concept of focus on the family in social work presents a challenge to the social worker who tries to carry out such a responsibility in a secular social work world. It presents a challenge because the social workers do not recognize the dichotomy between the philosophy as expressed by many schools and the social workers' responsibility to society. Most social workers coming out of schools today continue an intense interest in specializations. They see this interest as a means of helping the individual client and thus helping the entire family. It is as if by meeting individual needs first they strengthen the entire family. They never quarrel with the fact that the family is important but their practice reveals an unconscious reservation (at least we hope that it is an unconscious reservation). As a result, they find themselves termed child welfare workers, psychiatric social workers, medical social workers, adoption workers, correctional workers, and so forth. There is a lack of pride in being just "social workers."

The Catholic social worker has a prime responsibility to begin to carry out in practice what he and the Church stand for, that is, that whatever is done in social work is done with the intent of strengthening the family. In the case of the Catholic social worker, this must be not only a verbalization but a dynamic, conscious

awareness and acceptance of this principle as well as a deep sensitivity to the impact of social work services on the family.

Intake particularly has a responsibility because it is in Intake that we have our first working contact with the individual who needs our assistance. When Mr. J. comes to Intake because he feels he needs our service, our attitude and whatever we do at that point should be based not on an individual coming in for a service, but on an individual representing a family who need help. In effect, it is not Mr. J, but the family who is requesting service. Mr. J. needs to feel that what he does and what steps he takes, are done only because he wishes to carry out his responsibility to his family. Just because he expresses a need for a specific service does not mean that we think of the family as having that specific problem. Our main objective is to meet the problem of maintaining the family, that is, to strengthen relationships. For this reason it may be best to help the client understand early that it is necessary to come to the agency as a family unit, that is, both parents, or husband and wife. It is true that the husband or wife may be coming because they feel they need individual help. However, we have long recognized that unless all members of a family recognize a problem, there is often limited help that can be given to them. In the same fashion, a young girl or a boy coming in for help with personal problems must be helped to recognize that the entire family is involved and affected by the problem and that all may have to participate before the problem can be resolved. Social workers cannot create miracles. Neither can they work in a vacuum. Working with an individual may result in working in a vacuum. All agencies must begin to accept the responsibility to establish agency policy which spells out an Intake procedure involving the total family. Intake policy must begin to reflect this focus on family "togetherness."

In the area of child welfare service there is also need to express concern over our focus. We need to accept the premise that a child in placement is not a child isolated from the rest of his family. Obviously a child must at times be removed from the home. When this happens, however, he continues to remain a member of his family. To his environment he may add a temporary family such as that consisting of the foster parents or institutional personnel. However, in all except rare instances he will be expected to return to the natural family eventually. Many social work agencies, for

various reasons, try to meet the problem of the child through an arbitrarily or artificially set up division of the agency, such as a child welfare department. This may not be dangerous in all instances. Where it is dangerous is when we place responsibility for the natural family in one caseload and the responsibility for the child of that natural family in the hands of another worker. We fragment responsibility. Just yesterday in a conference meeting, there was a situation where we began to cut up the pie, so to speak. Our agency had to take the position that if this was necessary it had to be done with one agency accepting responsibility for the total family coordinating picture. We sometimes rationalize such arrangements by saying that we can give good service by coordinating the division of responsibility through conferences, and so forth. Nevertheless from my experience and the experience of many others this becomes an impractical operation overwhelmed by mechanics. A child in placement, except in extreme situations, should be helped to feel that he has a family from which he must temporarily be dislocated because a family problem of which he may be a part, has interrupted a normal pattern. His loyalties to the family must be continued. He may need to cooperate with the foster parents or the institutional personnel but the strengths that help him cooperate are the strengths that he derives from this deep understanding that he is part of a family group and is helping his family. In this fashion, even though problems exist, a child sees himself as a more normal child. He has a family like all other children; no one has "stolen" his family from him. It is difficult to maintain this kind of an atmosphere if the child's caseworker is one who has to work through an intermediary in order to reach his family or through a piecemeal division of responsibility within the family.

In a situation such as I describe or in any substitute home situation, the substitute or foster parents need a great deal of help in carrying out their substitute roles. They need to see themselves not as people who are replacing the natural parents but as individuals who are helping to strengthen the child for his return home. They cannot see their role as one which makes them compete for the child's affection. The child needs their home in order to effect a change. Such a focus requires a great deal of understanding from the foster family. We need to know a great deal about it also in order to maintain its strength. We need to

understand what our placements are doing in order to maintain strong foster homes. Records should reflect not only the service to the child but the placement as it continues to maintain a family for the foster parents. In other words, a child in a foster home receives help but so must the foster parents or else a question arises. A foster home used for placement puts a continuing responsibility on the social worker to continue to give service to the foster home so that it carries out its responsibility to its own family. Foster homes cannot be used if the only benefit derived is a benefit to the child. This cannot be at expense of the foster parents. We must see foster homes in their real sense, not only as homes having a need met through a placement of foster children with them, but also serving to help them grow as families. Foster parents do not stop being a family just because their own children are gone or because they never had natural children. Too many foster homes have "blown up" because we have remained blind to the foster parents as a family.

Another area in which we may need to examine casework services is in what is commonly called the family case. Social workers have tended to provide their casework in a very cloistered atmosphere. This, of course, is a result of many factors. Like other professions social workers have become clannish. They seek understanding of their work by other professions without recognizing that they tend to avoid implications with them and consequently there can be no deep understanding of the social work role. Social workers tend to criticize educators, physicians, lawyers and so forth, because these professions fail to understand and accept them. And yet, it is the rare social worker who extends himself and involves these other professions in working through common problems. The social worker accepts these professions as collateral contacts but not on an equal basis. The social worker fails to recognize that his is not the only helping profession. The social worker fails to recognize that many professions and laity are making a contribution to family life. In the Catholic Church particularly we have much Catholic Action which has the sanction of the hierarchy and which is making a contribution to strengthening the family.

In too many instances social workers have looked on these groups as mediocre and unimportant, so unimportant that there is indifference to them. Social workers have failed to accept and

use Catholic Action groups such as child discussion groups, Pre-Cana groups, family life groups, the St. Vincent de Paul Society, etc., in their work with families. There has been an over-emphasis on individual casework in many instances, with unfortunate results because help has been delayed. Families have many needs. Although they may need the leadership role of the caseworker they may not always need isolated, intensive, individual casework help. Caseworkers cannot personify themselves as gods in the helping profession field. Whenever possible or necessary they need to involve others in the process. They need to work with the Catholic Action groups which remain an untapped resource in the casework "box of tools." Several years ago, for instance, I served on a committee of lay people attempting to develop some literature for newly-married couples. When this literature was finally released, I shared it with some social worker friends. The common response from them was that the material was not professional, that help could not be expected from such material. What the social workers failed to recognize was that if such material was not made available by Catholic groups there was no opportunity to offset the many influences of readily available literature on the subject.

Catholic social workers need to keep in mind always their prime purpose and justification for existence. They have no purpose other than the purpose of the Church when it comes to the family. This purpose is to strengthen our society through the family. Each Catholic social worker must become a family worker. He must focus and maintain focus on the family in order to be of service to the individual. He can never feel self-sufficient. He must be aware of the many impacts on the entire family. He must work toward a new role which accepts the concept that our only reason for existence is to maintain the family.

Summary

IT seemed to be the consensus of this meeting that the voluntary family care agencies are dedicated by motivation, purpose and plan to the service of families and to individuals within family groups as members of an integrated whole. There seemed to be some agreement at least that the focus of attention is necessarily in most cases on the individual within the family group, but with emphasis on his relationship to the family as a whole. There was

considerable discussion on how family agencies might approach the problem of dealing with the individual as a member of the family unit and what impact the solution of his problems might have on this family unit.

One of the aspects of the theme "The Role of Voluntary Agencies" which was not developed in the morning session was whether or not these agencies should expand allied services such as counseling, rehabilitation of families whose children have been placed in institutions, etc.

The question of competent personnel at intake in the role of diagnosticians was considered an important aspect in the solution of the psychological disintegration of families.

It was the consensus that Catholic Charities has reached this stage: While its general function is still to try to meet the needs of all people, specific agencies must clarify their function, and provide that service which is in line with their skills. Agencies must withstand the pressures both from within and without, that would tend to deflect them from this function and service.

It is incumbent on each agency to define clearly what its function is, and to determine in terms of available staff and funds how this function can be performed in the best interests of families and in the highest tradition of Christian charity.—Roger Scott, *Recorder.*

CONFIDENTIALITY—A KEYSTONE IN CATHOLIC SOCIAL SERVICE

Chairman: Rev. John M. Harrington, *Catholic Charities, Westcester County, Yonkers, N. Y.*

Participant: Rev. Ernest L. Unterkoefler, S.T.L., J.C.D., *Secretary of the Tribunal, Diocese of Richmond*

MY TOPIC for this session—Confidentiality in Social Work—embraces a large field of thinking and action. The principles of moral theology and ethical codes must be brought to light upon the great number of circumstances in which the social worker lives and thinks. Social workers, administrators and directors are important people in the community today.

A noble impelling motive—love—guides your work. Conference of Supernatural Love would properly name the level on which you must please and work. Yet the queen of the virtues, charity,

does not directly embrace the course of my discourse this morning.

It is justice, social and commutative, which fundamentally determines the reasonable and moral actions of those who are custodians of confidential matters about persons helped.

The outline of my talk requires elaboration on:

1. The Need for Condentiality in Social Work.
2. Definition of Confidentiality.
3. Nature of Secrecy—Kinds of Secrets.
4. Areas of Conflict and Presumptions for Solution.
5. Corollaries.

The Need for Confidentiality

Upon reflection, the keeping of confidences and secrecy touches all aspects of human relations, private, public, professional and religious. Just as man is on the brink of conquering the mysteries of space and the hazards of interplanetary movement, so in the moral universe he is loosening the barriers and limitations of secrecy, silence, confidentiality.

Ours is an age of searching for facts in a continuous pursuit of details. Even in the Liturgy some would tear away, if they could, all mystery for the sake of knowledge. In the field of public relations, there is a constant thrust into the privacy of living both individually and corporately. And we know that our untiring governmental committees of investigation bring to the public eye many private actions, good or bad, which have no bearing on the public good.

In April, 1958 the *Journal* of the Child Welfare League of America, Inc., published an article, "Breaking the Barrier of Confidentiality." The writer, Victor Weingarten states:

> We've all been infiltrating the lines of confidentiality for a good many years—social workers, agency directors, publicists. Even the clients themselves.

I am not supporting this contention but it is a frank statement which the author corroborates with examples.

The need is also stressed in the fact that the National Social Welfare Assembly, Inc., published in April, 1958 the results of a two-year study on the subject "Confidentiality in Social Services to Individuals." It is not perfect, but it turns up with a broad view of the subject based on norms which ignore the supernatural, the theology of the matter. It is a secular approach, not giving

recognition to the importance of religious agencies in the social service field.

The need is also seen in the presumptive attitude that all associated with Catholic Charities are conscious of the obligations of conscience. Many are, but some are not, and the delinquents in the matter are among the lay and religious workers. Naturally, I am not tying the circle so rigidly that my subject is being equated with the seal of the confessional or an attitude of harmful silence when information and discussion among qualified persons is necessary.

The Definition

Having been trained in the scholastic method, I want to present the state of the question, then proceed to the definition.

The question is: Which are the principles that control the field of confidentiality in social work?

Confidentiality is that state of possession of the knowledge of a fact or condition in the mind of another and the consequent obligation to refrain from divulging this fact or condition.

For practical purposes, it is the preservation of secret information concerning the client which is disclosed in the professional relationship. Confidentiality, then, is based upon the basic right of the client to possess, own and dispose of his thoughts, ideas, facts about his personal status or behavior. The right is basic but not absolute. The social worker must be aware of the nature of the basic rights of an individual client, must respect the client's dignity as a human being, as an image of God. See the visage of God before you in the troubled dependent client.

The first obligation of the work is to recognize the *secret.* In order to aid in this, a brief elaboration of the theology of secrecy is necessary.

A secret is something hidden—*"id quod occultum est."* Its etymological Latin root *"secernere"* means to separate. The line of separation divides that which is public and something private. A man's intentions, motives, ambitions are concealed. What he records in his diary is his own. These are items which are shielded from the light of public scrutiny, from the eager curiosity of others. It is good to look upon secrets as the property of others.

In the diffusion of secret matter by observation, counseling, lawful investigation or by voluntary communication, the mind of

another absorbs the conditions, facts, etc. Hence, the fact or condition which formerly was the exclusive possession has found a residence in the mind of another and there it is entitled to a reasonable immunity and guardianship.

The kinds of secrecy vary with the source from which it arises and the relationship between the worker and the client.

1. The natural secret is any fact concerning a human being which, if made known would destroy the good name of a client, injure or unjustly sadden or embarrass the client. Social workers become the custodians of many natural secrets.

Since you see the image of God in your client and respect his dignity, you will preserve his right to a good reputation until it is forfeited. Detraction and calumny are the invaders of this sacred area and can easily be serious sins.

The second kind of secret is the promised secret. The virtue of fidelity requires that silence be observed about the matter.

A promised secret concerns a fact or a condition which a person pledges not to reveal. The promised secret may bind one's conscience from a twofold obligation: that of justice and fidelity. If it is solely a promised secret and does not embrace also the items of a natural secret, it binds solely through the virtue of fidelity.

The entrusted secret is a fact or condition about a client which is transmitted to another with the prior explicit or implicit understanding that the matter will not be divulged. Contractual obligations usually control the communication of this secret. The worker or the agency either explicitly or implicity assumes a contractual obligation. This as the promised secret may bind the recipient to keep the matter concealed even when there is no danger of defaming the reputation of the client.

Workers in the field of charity and social service do not divest themselves of their obligations as private individuals but assume greater responsibility to the individual and to the community.

The entrusted secret which is communicated to a private individual entails a serious contractual obligation of preserving the matter, but when the same matter is divulged to a professional person, it is called an official or professional secret. This embraces a more serious obligation. The professional secret binds even in many instances when a merely natural secret might be revealed licitly. The common good requires that professional people be available as known custodians of the confidence of their clients.

Ordinary citizens must be able to approach professional people in social work with the greatest faith in their conscientious observance of secrecy. An inquiring judge or a governmental official does not have the right to demand the revelation of a matter protected by the immunity of professional secrecy.

The obligation of secrecy, Father Noldin, a revered theologian, states is: "greater when it is entrusted to a private individual for the purpose of obtaining advice. It is still greater when it is entrusted to persons who are engaged in some public capacity of an official nature, such as lawyers, doctors, etc. It is greatest (apart from the sacramental secret) when it is entrusted to counsellors in public trials."

To reveal an entrusted secret to one responsible, prudent person even though loosely related to the agency under the bond of secrecy would not be a violation of the principle. The general norm to be followed is this:

> The entrusted secret obliges us in proportion to the amount of damage which would be unjustly inflicted or the public good or the private good by its violation.

Confidentiality in social work, then, is guided by sound theology. In social work all types of secrets come under the guardianship of the agency and its staff and workers. Who is to judge what is secret and what is not? Certainly, the director and his staff, the agency under the directing hand of the local Ordinary. But in inaugurating any code or formulae, do so with discernment. I agree with the opinion that all that is not objectively secret should be excluded from the circle of the social work secret, e.g., facts not contained in public records, but which are generally known, are easily knowable or will be known soon. It has been stated that about 50 items in social history and social problems are defamatory. It is with these items that the social worker must move with deliberate judgment.

When can the barriers of confidentiality be broken or invaded? These barriers can be broken when:

1. The client has a higher duty to himself;
2. The rights of other individuals are in serious conflict with the client's right;
3. The rights of the social worker are in jeopardy;
4. The rights of the social agency will be violated;
5. The rights of the community will be destroyed or injured.

The puzzle then is to determine which is a higher right in an individual case. This should give you comfortable room for discussion this morning and later this afternoon.

When there is a conflict of the right of confidentiality and a higher duty to himself, the presumption favors the right of confidentiality until the contrary is clearly proved.

The right of the client prevails when there exists conflict with the rights of another individual.

When there is a conflict with the rights of the social worker the client's right may give way since the presumption is that the caseworker could not have reasonably bound himself to secrecy at a great cost of reputation to himself.

Social agencies vary in their purpose for existence, services to the individual, family, community. In the light of these then there will be resolved the apparent or real conflict between the client and the agency.

The conflict with the rights of society as a whole can be resolved by following the principle that the obligation of the entrusted secret ceases when the preservation of the secret would cause a real and serious damage to the common good. St. Thomas Aquinas says, *"contra bonum commune nullum secretum licet recipere."* The inalienable rights of the individual cannot be surrendered except in most grave circumstances.

Because of the length of time which I have consumed and during which you have patiently listened, I am going to cover only one more aspect of conflict which is of vital importance to this Conference. Then I shall proceed to some conclusions drawn from this presentation and from my reading on this subject of confidentiality.

The area of conflict between the State and the individual's right to confidentiality, between the governmental agency and the client's right to secrecy is broad. Still greater is the duty of the religious agency to preserve its records, its case histories from the ever-widening and scrutinizing eye of the governmental bureau, the courts of justice which in some States promote a socialistic philosophy in serving the individual and the community.

I am in agreement with Monsignor O'Grady, beloved Secretary of the National Conference of Catholic Charities, when he states:

> We believe that the position of the worker in Catholic Charities agency is not too different from that of the priest in

the parish. If the families in the parish have confidence in the priest, they will refer their serious problems to him, but they will do so only on the basis of confidentiality. They usually have studied the priest; they know how far they can depend on him and if they do not have real confidence in him, they will find some other method of solving their problems.

Corollaries

1. In social work confidentiality is a fundamental, permanent concept. A productive relationship between agency and client, worker and client, government and agency must be founded on the concept of the dignity of each human being, an awareness of the image of God in the individual, and his supernatural destiny.

2. Confidentiality is a growing concept and has a disciplined flexibility rooted in principles of sound theology. The client always has the right to expect an agency to use information constructively.

3. The consent or presumed consent of the client is the first guide for the worker to consider in releasing himself from the obligation of secrecy.

4. The social agency has an obligation to draw the limits around the area of intramural disclosures.

5. The social agency should make known its policy on confidentiality to community agencies, police, etc. Agencies need to acquire more skill in explaining what is available and what is not available.

6. A research group should study the laws of individual States with the purpose of evaluating the laws pertaining to confidentiality in social work. Remedies in legislation could help the religious agency in its sacred responsibility to protect clients.

Summary

The very nature of the social casework situation involves the problem of personal information which is revealed, quite often under the stress of a difficult situation. The careful use of this information is the problem of confidentiality, and it calls for the infusion of sound philosophy and theology into often confused thinking in regard to principles..

The principles are basically simple. The material revealed by a client which is damaging or embarrassing to him is protected by professional secrecy, obliging us in justice and frequently in fidelity

to its preservation. Although the presumption is always in favor of the preservation of secrecy, there are circumstances which permit the revelation of secret information—circumstances involving a conflict between the client's right to secrecy and some higher right. These superior rights are: (1) the higher duty of the client to himself, e.g., the preservation of life; (2) the rights of the individual when those rights are prior or of greater value; (3) the rights of the social worker or the social agency to protect his reputation or the agency's reputation; and (4) the common good of the community.

In circumstances other than these, the client's consent, either explicity or implicity given, must be secured before confidential information may be shared.

The subsequent discussion of particular application of these principles prompts the workshop to make the following recommendations to the Conference at large:

1. That there be provisions in future National Conferences of Catholic Charities for a more detailed discussion of the problem of confidentiality and that consideration be given by the Conference to the establishment of a standing committee to work out problem areas.

2. That it be recommended to individual agencies that detailed statements of principles and practices be made available to staff and discussed frequently—to cover such problems as the type of information to be sought, its recording, the security of records and their availability to non-professional staff, the kind of consent we seek before sharing information.

3. That the National Conference of Catholic Charities seek in whatever way is deemed feasible the status of privileged communication for casework records.

4. That agencies re-examine their participation in the Social Service Exchange in the light of the several principles applicable.

5. That agencies re-examine their practices in the intra- and inter-agency sharing of confidential information.

6. That Schools of Social Service consider informing students of the legal implications of recorded material. — Rev. John Ahearn, *Recorder.*

FAMILY LIFE EDUCATION—A RESPONSIBILITY OF CATHOLIC CHARITIES AGENCIES

Chairman: Mrs. Joseph Mantey, *Cleveland, Ohio*
Participants: 1. Joseph W. Fenstemacher, *Executive Director, Catholic Charities, Hazleton, Pa.*

IT IS often said that the world of tomorrow will be what the next generation makes it. If we sincerely believe this to be true then the most important task facing us today is to rear a generation of citizens who can help achieve a secure and peaceful world in which to live.

We have a great deal of knowledge about what is required for healthy growth and development but only as our young people grow up in homes which give a clear understanding of the factors which go into good Christian family life can we hope to achieve our full destiny; for there is no question that the family is still the basic unit of society.

The focus of this paper is Family Life Education—A Responsibility of Catholic Charities Agencies. During recent years there has been widespread interest in the establishment of programs of family life education on a formalized educational basis, as well as on a non-formal basis. The trend in our modern educational system is to include courses in practically all phases of family living. This is true on the secondary, as well as the university level. However, this paper will not concern itself with family life education as formal classroom study but rather with the concerns and needs of family day-by-day living.

The social scientists in their research and studies regarding today's family readily agree that family life during the last several generations has changed more drastically and more rapidly than ever before in the history of man. However, there is often wide disagreement as to the implications of the change. Yet one thing is certain; there is confusion, bewilderment and disruption in our modern family life. That confusion reigns, has long been apparent to those who work with family problems. Certainly, the social worker before he has practiced very long becomes aware of the disruption in family life.

Rev. Charles Hugo Doyle* in his book, *Sins of Parents,* points

* *Sins of Parents,* by Charles Hugo Doyle. New York, The Nugent Press, 1951.

out that "it is no great task to make parents understand the adverse effects of the great sins of commission, such as divorce, separation, desertion or alcoholism upon children. What many fail to understand is that the parental sins of omission can be equally tragic." I doubt that a day goes by that a social caseworker does not find this to be a truism. Father Doyle also observes that "knowledge will not be infused with the nuptial blessing—it must be learned."

In a study on Scope and Methods of the Family Service Agency†, it is pointed out that the purpose of the family agency is "to contribute to harmonious family inter-relationships, to strengthen the positive values of family life, and to promote healthy personality development and satisfactory social functioning of various family members." Are we to take this to mean that the focus of our work is limited to casework treatment alone? I think not —for if we are to strengthen the positive values of family life, we have a duty to extend ourselves to the broader area of prevention; we must not sit in an ivory tower waiting for the pathologic family to seek us out for help.

There are many organizations and agencies giving excellent help and suggestions to couples, Catholic as well as non-Catholic, regarding family life, especially in the area of child development and training. Many of the problems encountered are moral, as well as social in character but the methods of these organizations and agencies, even though based on sound psychological principles, are lacking in any religious note. Catholic families desperately need some assistance and suggestions from Catholic specialists in parent education. Some means should be worked out whereby persons well-grounded in Catholic doctrine and trained in child psychology, child-parent relations, marriage and family living can offer this assistance. Because of the very nature and organizational structure of the Catholic social agency we in Catholic social work have the means and responsibility to institute and offer programs in family life education.

In its beginning the basic purpose of the medical profession was the curing of disease. Today the profession is as interested in the prevention of disease as in treatment. The legal profession is as interested in the prevention of crime as in prosecuting offenders against the social order. Thus, if social work is to attain its

† "Scope and Methods of the Family Service Agency," The Family Service Organization of America. New York, 1953.

full stature as a true profession it must be as interested in the prevention of the breakdown of the family, the basic unit of society, as in the treatment of the pathological family.

Our hope for family stability lies in education that will enable families to withstand the demands and stresses of modern society. A program of family life education, using every possible opportunity to emphasize the importance of good Christian family living must not be taken lightly. I am in full agreement with Dick Kelly, Executive Secretary, Catholic Youth Service Bureau, Cleveland, Ohio, who, in discussing this program wrote me the following: "Social work training and experience, concerned as they are with the significance of interpersonal relationships, provide an unusual preparation for family life education. Furthermore, our work as social workers gives us daily understanding of serious personal and family problems. This knowledge of parent-child relationships and insight into factors which determine the quality of family relationships should be made available to groups of people sincerely interested in learning ways of developing sound and healthy relationships and who also wish to deal constructively with the realities of everyday life."

We all recognize that the Bishops of the United States are vitally concerned with the preservation and strengthening of Catholic family living and that the Church has various programs designed to this end. The Family Life Bureau—NCWC, through its programs of Pre-Cana and Cana Conferences and the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine, attempt to provide the opportunity to people sincerely interested in learning ways of developing the sound and healthy relationships of which I speak. Unfortunately, however, social work does not appear to be part of these programs. It seems to me that the social worker in our Catholic agencies has a part to play in these programs.

Somehow there should be an effort made by the Family Life Bureau—NCWC, and the Catholic Charities agencies to cooperate in a program of family life education. We all recognize that in a Pre-Cana or Cana Conference the priest leader would not think of excluding the physician who has the knowledge and experience of dealing with the physical side of marriage. I doubt if any social worker of experience and stature is ever thought of as being a participant in a Pre-Cana or Cana Conference. This may be due to the fact that the leaders do not see our place here. This group

might now be asking how we can become part of the family life movement.

First of all, social workers must not be thought of as dealing only with sick individuals or families. We do have knowledge and experience in dealing with the normal as well as the abnormal.

Secondly, it is possible that with the participation of the social caseworker the Pre-Cana or Cana group may enter into discussions more freely because they see the social worker as a less authoritative person than the priest leader, and they are more apt to express feelings, both positive and negative, and even mixed about what has been presented. A trained and experienced social worker can make use of this expression of feeling to help the group to look at all the issues involved. Thus the total Conference program can be a more decisive influence in the formation of proper attitudes toward good Christian family living.

I would like to conclude by re-affirming that the Catholic social agency has a responsibility of participating in or establishing a sound program of family life education. Because of professional knowledge and experience the social worker can be an asset to the already existing programs in the family life movement. There are areas in which the experienced social worker is best qualified to act. For instance, in a pre-Cana Conference group a trained female social worker may be much better able to handle the young ladies in the more intimate discussions of sexual attitudes and fears than the priest leader or even the physician.

Where the family life movement is not yet active, the Catholic social agency has a responsibility and a right to offer to the community a program of family life education. Is it not true that the Catholic social agency exists as an arm of the Church and that we have an obligation to supplement the work of the parish priest in the care of souls in our modern society?

2. William G. Martindale, *Assistant Referee and Probation Officer, Juvenile Court, Cleveland, Ohio*

THIS morning you heard Mr. Fenstemacher discuss the idea of a family life education program. He outlined the specific need for this type of service and the reasons why it should be offered through our Catholic Charities agency.

In this session we shall try to set before you two facets of our thinking concerning this program:

1. Content.
2. Qualifications of Leader.

Primarily we are offering a service to parents to help them understand the reasons for their own and their children's behavior. Freud has taught us that the quality of the small child's relationships with his father and mother, with his siblings is the most important influence in his life experiences. There is an interaction of these various relationships with the result that the family constellation in which the child functions is itself the product of several interrelationships between different people with different needs and different potentials. Through the birth of the child a different family constellation comes into being and a new mode of life is entered into. Early family relationships, however, are not the only forces that mold personality; later experiences, environmental changes, also are factors which will influence personality development all through life.

Today many parents ask questions such as:

1. What do you mean by positive parent-child relationships?
2. What kind of family relationships are conducive to healthy personality development?
3. How can parents help their child to grow into a happy and well-adjusted citizen?

Many publications have been written in recent years in an effort to help parents understand the needs of their children. Too often, however, the generalized or specialized criteria for parenthood lead many parents astray. For example:

Too generalized—the child needs love, affection, security;
Too specialized—the child should be breast fed; send the only child to nursery school.

The parents are confused and over-anxious; they follow these "prescriptions" to the letter and then when disturbances occur, are at a loss to understand why John didn't "turn out like the book said."

In any discussion group parents will tend to ask specific questions related to their own children. The reason they ask this type of question is that it is the means of expressing the parent's own experience and reflects his current anxiety. The leader should

be able to connect certain areas of concern as he meets with various parent groups.

Mothers of pre-school-age youngsters will ask questions about feeding, weaning, toilet training, aggression, discipline, sex education, death.

Mothers of school-age children will ask questions about: aggression, discipline, sex instruction, family chores, responsibilities, allowances, family standards, dating, and prejudice.

Since many specific questions will be asked, how will the group leader avoid giving stereotyped platitudes for answers. It will depend upon his ability to use the parents' specific questions to develop with and for the group certain general concepts and principles of positive family relationships. We do not plan a "didactic, lecturn approach," nor do we plan to develop all principles of sound parent-child relationships. Some parents may already be familiar with some of these. Time will not permit it. The leader must be flexible in his goals and be able to alter his purpose when the occasion demands.

Some principles of positive parent-child relationships:

1. Role of parent is to help child develop socially acceptable behavior which will satisfy the child's healthy needs and drives. (Set limits, but do not crush individuality.)
2. Parents should be mindful of "age adequate maturity". (Child of 6 not expected to act like 3.)
3. Parents should give to a child according to his needs. (Affection, privileges, material objects, responsibilities. Not all alike.)
4. Child must have confidence and trust in parents. (Always tell the child truth.)
5. Parental example and behavior are of paramount importance.
6. Parents should recognize own as well as child's feelings, needs, emotions, conscious and unconscious, motivation. (Anxiety, rejection, hostility, disapproval.)
7. Parents alone are not responsible for child's development. (Constitution, culture, race, environment, group.)
8. Needs and satisfactions should be balanced. (Family considered as unit.)

9. Meet needs at a time when they are present. (Flexible)

Happy parent-child relationships are based primarily upon a harmonious marital relationship between the parents. There will be ups and downs, and friction, but in the main, positive feelings will be predominant.

Specific questions can be related to these principles. For example, questions of discipline, relate to 1 and 2.

Three factors will be largely responsible for development of better understanding by the participants:

1. Influence of the group—members give suggestions, support and criticism. New ideas come to the members. Other parents face same problems, thus anxiety is relieved.
2. Relationship with group leader—his professional knowledge, experience—he accepts but does not criticize.
3. Choice of questions to be discussed should interest all members. For example, problem of children's fears. What are these? What can parent do? Are all fears unrealistic and damaging? Do not discuss dynamics of fear.

Who can be group leader?

The group leader must be a person of experience and professional status who has:

1. Knowledge and understanding of normal human behavior;
2. Considerable knowledge and understanding of psychopathology;
3. Understanding of the interplay of family life and its importance for the individual;
4. Understanding of community life and its importance to the individual and his family;
5. Understanding of the helping relationship and its management;
6. Understanding of the principal types of parental attitudes;
7. Academic training—professional degree, philosophic concept of man, economic training, psychological training;
8. Personal qualifications—integrity, personal holiness, charity, interest in mankind, personal experience in marriage;
9. Knowledge of laws governing children's behavior, curfew regulations, driving, drinking, education laws, military service.

Summary

PRIESTS, Directors, Religious, professional workers and volunteers all realize unmistakably that it is the family which shapes the mind of the child. Several years ago the Bishops of the United States stated that it is the quality of the family relationship which determines whether our children are to grow, develop, and move on to maturity—for it is the family that lastingly shapes the tastes, temperament, the total personality of all of its members.

Today our sectional meeting considered Family Life Education—a Responsibility of Catholic Charities Agencies.

It was the consensus of the group that there is a definite need for Catholic leadership and participation in a family life education program, provided through professional social work under Catholic auspices. It was agreed that other community agencies have already recognized this need, and have taken steps to provide such a service.

With our Catholic families striving to do what is best for the home, striving to find their place in the scheme of things, it was recognized that there is danger in not assuming this responsibility, which may result in many of our Catholic laity seeking service from organizations whose principles are not compatible with Catholic teachings. We must not allow this opportunity to pass by default.

There was general recognition that considering all of our diocesan services, there is still a definite need for a positive program for family living.—JACK LYONS, Caseworker, Catholic Youth Service Bureau, Cleveland, Ohio, *Recorder.*

SUBURBIA—WHITHER CATHOLIC CHARITIES

Chairman: RT. REV. MSGR. JOHN A. MCMAHON, *Pastor, St. Sabina Church, Chicago, Ill.*

Participants: 1. MISS HELEN MCDANIEL, *Supervisor, Catholic Welfare Bureau, Columbus, Ohio.*

SUBURBIA presents a problem to all social institutions, the church, the school and social agencies. Business apparently has solved the problem to some extent through shopping centers. The church and school through knowledge of statistics, and normal

population growth can plan with some realistic far-sightedness, yet they too face problems. Social work agencies seem to have to wait for an expressed need and so are handicapped because of their apparent inherent structure in moving ahead and being ready to meet the problem when it arises. This is a community organization problem but it is a very realistic problem to the family agency and my particular part in this program is to offer suggestions from the standpoint of the casework staff and to throw into the hopper propositions for certain changes within the framework of the agency, which may help to give service to our suburban friends.

After struggling with this paper for a few days and nights, I thought of a Director of Charities who was quoted as saying: "Let's just be quiet and they won't know we're here". The "ignore it and it will go away" approach is, as we know, the simple solution. But as members of the Mystical Body, we feel a responsibility for our fellow man who is in need and so we have to face an unsolved problem realistically and then act toward the solution. The practitioner, to use Harper's identifying term, wishes to share this experience with the administration. I don't believe that our so-called struggle for status and all of its implications hamper us from having a pioneer spirit. It, however, is sometimes harder to be pioneers when it comes to changing accepted patterns, than it is to travel an unchartered course. This paper may reflect a certain rebellious matter and may be radical to a certain extent. If so, there will be more to discuss. Maybe this would be the time to suggest that we discontinue dictation and statistics, and revise our supervisory patterns. You see, I have a vested interest and am not quite ready to discontinue supervision.

Let us approach this problem from a caseworker's eye and look at Mr. and Mrs. Suburbia as a family with a problem. Then we will diagnose the situation and offer alternate treatment plans.

John and Edna Suburbia are in their middle thirty's. They have five children, two boys and three girls, ranging in age from 3 to 13. John is a salesman who has worked for several companies and at the present time is making $5,500.00 a year. Edna works at a downtown department store to supplement the income as they are buying their home. She has hired several baby sitters and the only contact with Catholic Charities has been to call for an old-age pensioner who would like to live in "more for home than

wages." The three older children are in parochial school, the younger two are in nursery school for the "group experience."

Our family lives in a ranch type house with three bedrooms, living room, dining area and kitchen. There is a patio and a car-port. They have not as yet paid off the loan which they made for a down payment. They are making payments on everything from the T.V. set to the power mower. They look like the rest of the neighbors right down to the bermuda shorts which are distinct aids for working in the yard. So far they are very typical suburbanites. However, they have a few symptoms because of which we as social workers, if we knew them, would say, "Here's a family who needs help."

John and Edna have ceased to enjoy their family. They are constantly worried about the possibility of having another child. They can never seem to get their heads above water financially. John has an ulcer of course (who hasn't). They quarrel a great deal about money, just not knowing where it goes. The house is always a mess and Edna seems to work all the time. The bills are only surmounted by the ironing which has to be done. There are always stacks of it and this irritates John no end. The children have various symptoms which are of concern to their parents. John, Jr., who is 13, can't seem to get along with children his own age. He is constantly bullying the younger children in the neighborhood. Recently he has begun to steal things with no apparent motive. The two smaller children have had temper tantrums and the youngest, age three, seems to be accident prone.

John and Edna are worried about their children but do not know where to go for help. Neither feels that anyone can really help.

Although, I would hesitate to say that John and Edna were typical people of their neighborhood, I would say that their type could be found on most any block. Can a family agency help this family—can Catholic Charities help them help themselves?

Barriers Which Seem to Prohibit Help

John and Edna are faced with certain barriers which would seem to hinder them getting help. Here are a few:

1. They both work every day during the hours Catholic Charities is open.

2. They are great conformists and are not aware of anyone else receiving help with their domestic difficulties.
3. They are pre-conditioned toward thinking that Catholic Charities exists only for the poor.
4. The Charities office is downtown with no parking space.
5. They have heard of "red tape".
6. They have heard of records being kept.
7. They also may have heard from presumed reliable sources that "they never do anything down there".

All of these conditions, whether accurate or not, are keeping away from us people who are in real need of help. Probably you can think of many other reasons.

Barriers Within the Agency Which Prohibit Help

These barriers we are all too famliar with:

1. Our caseloads are so high we feel inadequate in helping those who are already active with the agency.
2. We never have time to catch up with the dictation which has accumulated from last month, last year, 1950 perhaps.
3. Turnover of workers is a big problem with most agencies; it is time-consuming as well as expensive. I mention this after dictation as there might be a connection.
4. Caseworkers are instilled with the idea that the client must want help before he can be helped and therefore they are often content with the present caseload as representing the persons who should be served.
5. There has been a movement within the field which seems to demand the clinic approach of treatment in the office by therapeutic interviewing. The "going out to people" has been questioned by some in the profession.
6. We should look objectively at supervision as possibly inhibiting some initiative in the practitioners' field.

Again, these may be contributing factors which some of us would question as being valid and on the other hand there may be many more.

"Have Trailer—Will Travel"

I would like now to offer some suggestions about possible plans of treatment. The solution, so to speak, may be larger than the problem but, for what they are worth, here are some ideas about

reaching Mr. and Mrs. Suburbia, about techniques of help after reaching them, and about streamlining our *modus operandi.*

As I see it, the situation is somewhat complicated to say the least. On the one hand we have trained and untrained people who are employed for and dedicated to help people through casework services. Already they seem to be overworked. On the other hand we are faced with a group of people who, we know from all laws of statistics and from cause and effect, are suffering from family tension and possible breakdown, plus all the by-products.

"Have trailer—will travel" may not be a bad idea for reaching the suburban family. Servicing any one community may not be a full-time job so this would enable the worker to serve more than one area. We have become used to bookmobiles and traveling X-ray units, why not add a mobile social service?

We have often considered assigning workers to various parishes as in districts throughout the diocese. This has many advantages as it gives a worker a sense of belonging totally to a particular job where he truly represents the Charities office. In other words he is all things to these people. The pastor usually likes this too. So often it helps to have a personal link with the office, other than through the priests. Some one to whom the pastor can make a referral directly will serve to bring the office closer to the parish.

The school social worker is a rather new classification within our profession. As we know many family difficulties are manifested by symptoms in the children. Certainly early detection of symptoms should give us a better chance to help the family. A school social worker might be the person who could help in suburbia. There are probably strong points on both sides as to whether this worker should be a part of the school set-up or the Charities office. A point in favor of attachment to the Charities office is the ease with which all agency services would be available to the client. A point in favor of the worker not being attached to the agency is that he or she may be more of an integral part of the school system.

Branch offices in the suburbs are not foreign to some of the people at this meeting. I would presume they work the same as branch offices in other cities. How autonomous the branch office would be in its own locale would be an administrative decision. However, certain staff services could be offered from the central

office. In fact the supervisor could travel. Some parishes probably have their own social workers who are not attached to a central office in any way. If the pastor knows what a social worker's job entails this could be a solution.

You might wonder where we can obtain these extra social workers. Many studies are being made within the profession to determine what positions can be held by people who are untrained. In-service training may enable persons of limited training to give certain services within the framework of social work, thereby expanding our field.

If we are unable to increase our staff to accommodate the added work load to meet the suburban group but still choose one of the above plans of operation, we might consider a streamlining of our practices within the agency.

In my way of thinking our present system of record keeping is a cultural lag. A doctor couldn't begin to serve his patients if he kept an account of all the superfluous data which might have some bearing on the case at hand. For new workers who need closer direction and also to supply the demand for teaching records perhaps we could use tape recordings.

Statistics in many offices seem to be bigger than any of us. If dictation and statistics were made easier, possibly more social workers would stay in the field. The caseworker, freed from the manual tasks which have become identified with the profession, could spend more time giving direct service to the client. It might behoove any agency to have a job analysis performed to determine what is necessary and what is obsolete.

Much thought is being given to supervision these days and many agencies are experimenting with new methods. We might ask ourselves whether or not we are keeping the worker from maturing on the job. What are the positive aspects of supervision and how can we best employ them and eliminate the negative, so to speak. Should we decentralize our staffs to meet the problem of suburbia? No doubt supervision will have to readjust to meet this need. I'm not sure that group supervision will be a time-saving device although in itself it may be a good thing. Certainly allowing the mature worker, who knows the policies of the agency, and who can work independently except for consultation, to do so, would add more hours which could be spent directly with the client.

A medical secretary who could handle the medical program for children under agency care is a further suggestion. Another time-saver is one which is in operation by our local Child Welfare Board. Foster parents are being paid extra to cover cost of clothing and incidentals. This plans has been inaugurated but at present it is suffering from a shortage of funds.

Conclusion

I have attempted to present Mr. and Mrs. Suburbia as living American people who have problems very similar to the ones we meet every day. There are barriers on the part of the family because of certain attitudes but the agency is hampered too by being unable to employ staff, establish offices and really become available to these persons in need of help. There is one factor which should lead to a favorable solution. Mr. and Mrs. Suburbia have much in common with many of us. If we find the place to meet, the rendevous should be fruitful.

2. Ralph Henry Smith, *Executive Director, United Funds, Inc., Providence, R. I.*

THE overriding concern of this Conference, is a most appropriate one in this hour of our national life. Certainly, we can all readily agree that we are living in a period where there is conflict, confusion and breakdown all around us. The challenge of constant, rapid and radical change is likely the most important single challenge of our generation. At such a time it is of first importance to all of us as individuals, to our agencies and our community that we carefully study the facts of life, that we keep our faith in people and that we develop our role in the social order so that individually and collectively we can all make our maximum contribution to the collective life we lead together.

An important segment of this total mission is found in the tremendous change and confusion in our collective lives resulting in not a growing, but an "exploding" suburbia.

All over America, from the Golden Gate to Cape Cod and from Minnesota to the Gulf, this problem is before not only social service, but schools, businesses and practically every aspect of our congregate living. Some call this the metropolitan problem, some call it the problem of suburbia. I choose to call it the problem of a growing nation.

Social welfare doesn't have a monopoly on this problem. The physical planners worry about problems concerning proper utilization of land. There is need to cope with demand for roads in order to assure uncongested flow of traffic. Adequate housing, zoning problems, utilities, shopping facilities—these, too, are problems needing solution. The economists are confronted with problems of their own. As suburbia develops, the tax structure undergoes severe strains. The downtown city area, which usually carries the largest tax burden, is beginning to feel the loss of revenue as new shopping centers, industrial and commercial ventures spring up in suburbia. The process of adjusting the tax structure may become one of the acute economic problems as the flight to the suburbs continues. The schools face a major problem as older areas have classrooms to spare and newer areas do not have enough classrooms, resulting in overcrowded classes, double shifts, mediocre teaching. Churches also feel the impact of movement to suburbia, as older areas experience diminishing congregations and churches in newer areas are overcrowded.[1]

This is an appropriate and important subject for this Conference or any Conference of this nature. In 1954, I participated in a Conference held in St. Louis, Mo., of Community Chests and Councils of America on the same subject. In almost every regional, state or national Conference of Social Work, this subject is of vital importance. In the literature of the social welfare field, this subject appears and reappears. Unquestionably it is a paramount issue calling for our most serious attention.

In light of this situation, I would like to throw into the hopper some ideas that seem to me to make sense.

1. The problem of suburbia or the metropolitan problem is not a problem that confines itself only to our large metropolitan areas like New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, Los Angeles, San Francisco, Houston, Texas, Washington, D. C. This problem is also found in Albany, N. Y., population 120,000; Altoona, Pa., with 80,000 people; Fargo, N. Dak., with 35,000 people and even down into smaller corporate areas called communities.
2. We simply are not going to have the money and personnel

---

[1] "Suburbanitis," *Proceedings of the 1954 Adirondack Workshop*, Community Chests and Councils of America, New York, N. Y.

> to organize new agencies along our old-line structure to keep pace with this phenomenon of population growth. In 1957, only 1,600 to 1,700 persons were graduated from social work schools to fill more than 10,000 existing jobs. Unless there is substantial increase in enrollment before 1961, the number of unfilled jobs will be many times greater.

On the money side, the 2,041 odd United Funds and Councils in 1957 raised $414,575,641 to support some 25,000 social service agencies in these 2,041 communities. Now, while this represents a tremendous growth from the $192,933,988 raised by 1,318 Chests in 1950, don't let these huge sums distort our vision. Really, what we in the United Funds and Councils are doing is growing at a rate of roughly 5% per year, whereas, the needs of agencies are increasing at a much faster rate. If you examine this money situation from the standpoint of funds raised as a percentage of nation income, or of expenditure per capita, it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that our funds simply are not keeping up with our needs.

May I add a plea for all of us in this field to become more sensitive, understanding and appreciative of this problem of finance. I sense a marked indifference of the profession of social work as a whole to the financial aspects of social welfare, and slight attention paid to this subject in the curricula of schools of social work, plus a conspicuous absence of substantial contributions either to the literature or to financial policy formation from professional social workers. This suggests the need for some discussion of the relevance of this subject to the attainment of the goals of social work.

Now, let me get back on the track again. In the first place, I have said that in facing the needs of an exploding population, 90% of which is to be found in suburbia, we will not have the personnel to handle this prodigious task. In the second place, I have said that our available funds will not keep up with our expanding need. Let me put these two ideas in the order I see them to be and say even if a miracle of finance would happen and we would have all the money we needed, we still could not answer the social service needs of suburbia with the apparently simple answer of "more of the same" social service program we have today. We would not have the people to develop "more of the same." This

simple answer of "more of the same" will not suffice. Great sums of money and endless reservoirs of personnel are not needed as much as imagination and creative thought. Only in this way can we live up to our commitment to serve people better in these turbulent times with competence and compassion.

The need for imagination and creative thought is made ever more evident as a result of Bradley Buell[2] and his associates in their St. Paul study and in a number of social breakdown studies. In these studies, Buell and Associates call our attention to the "hard-core" cases, the 6% of our population absorbing about 50% of all our social service. The lesson of these studies is put in simple language when it is said, "We can do a better job with what we have than we are doing!" I think all of us would agree that in gearing our social services to meet the needs of suburbia, we must chant the line of a popular song, "There'll Be Some Changes Made." Change is an inevitable part of our American way of life and it must become an essential ingredient of our social work thinking and doing.

In meeting the needs of suburbia, it seems to me that four steps are necessary procedures, viz.,

1. A general sensitivity to change, its existence and implications.
2. Research for collecting and evaluating the facts of change
3. Planning to meet these changes.
4. Coordinating our individual efforts and programs to get this job done.

What are some of the obstacles in the way of this needed change?

I put the major obstacles in this order:

1. Traditions and vested interests.
2. Personalities.
3. Legal and constitutional requirements.
4. Inadequacy of needed personnel.
5. Inadequacy of funds.

An awareness of these obstacles must, of course, influence our timing as we attack these problems, but it should never reduce the

---

[2] Bradley Buell and Associates, *Community Planning for Human Services*. Columbia University Press, New York, 1952.

importance of staying with the problem until our objectives are realized.

As I see the ever-increasing problems ahead of us all in social work, they are in this order:

First—Massive population increases with great increases in the number of children and aged.

It is estimated that the current age distribution of our population, combined with the effects of future births and death rates, will produce a much larger proportion of persons 65 years and over, and under 20 years of age. Together, these groups will represent half the total population in 1970 and they will account for nearly three-fourths of the population increase between 1955 and 1970.

The number of persons 65 years of age or older will expand from 15 million to 21 million by 1970. The group will represent 9.3% of the total population as compared with the current 8.4%.

By 1970, nearly 90 million persons in the United States will be under 20 years of age in contrast to 63 million in 1955. This group will represent 40% of the total population—an increase of nearly 11% above the current distribution. As is true for the older population groups, the younger population groups present special social service problems.[3]

Now, these figures of 27,000,000 additional children and 6,000,000 additional aged people, indicate a tremendous increase in our social service programs set up to meet the needs of dependent, defective and delinquent children as well as our many character building programs; they also tell us of the great growth of the entire field of geriatrics.

These children will all be in our schools. Doesn't this indicate a need of much better school-social agency teamwork? The aged will come into their retirement from industry. This seems to spell out the need for much better liaison between personnel men in industry and with industry generally. We cannot put out more paper than we can redeem. When we say social service can help these children and aged, we must be ready, willing and able to

[3] U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, *The Advancement of Medical Research and Education*, Final Report of the Secretary's Consultants on Medical Research and Education, Wash., D. C., June 27, 1958,

redeem such a promise. In both these areas, there is great need for pilot demonstrations and tests of how social service can help with this gigantic problem posed by tremendous increases in the numbers of children and aged.

Second—Changes involved in the deterioration of our cities and the phenomenal growth of our suburbs.

Third— The breakdown of older living patterns and family solidarity.

All the processes of social work, casework, group work, community organization, must combine to deal with individual and communal problems which result.

In bringing together a picture of these years ahead, the facts are these:

1. 228,000,000 people by 1975, 54,000,000 more people than we have today.
2. 38,600,000 of these people living in the suburbs.
3. 6,000,000 more people 65 years or older.
4. 27,000,000 more persons under 20 years of age.
5. Fewer social workers and trained personnel.
6. Limited funds.

The overriding question of this session is the question posed by Monsignor Gallagher, "Should we follow the people into the suburbs with separate agencies or should we remain in a single multi-phased program in the central city?"

In direct answer to this question, I would say we should do both, depending on the particular service and need of our own particular area. My experience and reading on this question convince me there is no one pattern of service being developed. However, if we think in terms of competence and of short supply of personnel and money, maybe our only way out at this time is to develop one competent agency with outpost or district services.

I would like to offer for your consideration, four generic convictions regarding the problem of social services and exploding suburbia. I also remind you that I have been requested to approach this problem from the standpoint of the broad need of the community. Therefore, I am not looking at this from the viewpoint of Catholic Charities *per se*. You will have to apply these convictions to your own particular situation.

These four convictions are:

1. Number one is that suburbia calls for a new dimension in our thinking. We must cling tenaciously to the fundamental philosophical concept that the mission of social work is to serve people regardless of geographical and political divisional lines. People needing the services of our agency should receive them regardless of the accident of their place of residence. Thoughts of our community as a place defined by corporate limits need to be replaced with a community concept embracing the area, even if that area crosses state, county and municipal lines. As one looks at this problem from the standpoint of physical planning, economic development, traffic, schools, or social welfare and citizen reactions, it seems as though we have developed "town-line myopia." That myopia or nearsightedness seems to stop our vision at the town line and makes it difficult to recognize the fact that contiguous territory obliterates and erases for all practical purpose what we once called the town line. Unless our thinking and our viewpoint are characterized with this new dimension of the area as an entity, one just can't get started at all in attacking this problem.
2. My second conviction is that all of us in social service have to learn to study our social needs, not from the agency point of view. We must examine our changing social order from the standpoint of the people and their problems. We must stand ready to alter existing agency structure to meet the existing need. If we place a premium on existing agency structure, we will be no more able to meet the needs of our growing nation than we could go to the moon in an old-fashioned gasoline engine, propeller driven airplane. In other words, we must think in such terms as "systematic community screening" of social problems. Procedures need to be developed for "systematic screening" of family problems by the schools, personnel men, police, public and private welfare agencies. An early identification of these problems through such channels offers tremendous promise of much better utilization of our available services. This type of "systematic screening" or "community intake" provides a better chance for more competent diagnosis, and again

more effective treatment. Are we ready, willing and able to form such a systematic intake with wholehearted cooperation of family, group work, protective and health agencies? Maybe we should ask ourselves, have we really ever tried this type of cooperative effort? As I see such a "systematic screening," the intake unit would assemble all available data about the problem family, evaluate the information and assign the case to the appropriate treatment service. Such a unit would perform the function of bringing agencies together to pool information regarding the problem under treatment. This approach is centered entirely in people and their problems. It is true the proposal requires the expenditure of staff time and talent. But this approach would enable us to do a better job with our existing resources.

3. My third conviction has to do with the raising and spending of money for voluntary social services. In a complicated metropolitan area, the Univac couldn't credit everyone's gift to their own home town. Consistent with and consonant with an area point of view and a "people-centered" concern, we in Rhode Island have developed a basic principle, viz., *"Raise the money where it is and spend it where it is needed."* There is nothing too new about this idea. Our taxes, either national, state or local, have followed this course for years. It is plain common sense. The common welfare of people is always an indivisible entity. Much of our gold coast taxes are spent in our slum areas. Much of the wealthier States' taxes are spent in critical areas. Many State taxes collected in rich metropolitan districts are spent in what we called back in Minnesota, "distressed counties." As we move into the problems of suburbia in the next few years, I am more and more convinced that to meet the problems of exploding suburbia, we must adhere to the philosophy that money should be raised where it is and spent where it is needed. It strikes me that there is both compassion and competency in this concept.
4. My fourth conviction is that we take the concept of research and planning out of the ivy clad tower and intellectual discussion and put it to work. Much of our current

planning in health, welfare and other fields came after our agencies were already established, just as many physical planning bodies came into existence after communities had developed. In this time of our life we are presented with an opportunity to do some planning in these communities before they become fully developed. The physical planners are busy at their job. There are some evidences of State and area planning. We in social welfare must not allow the social service programs to grow like Topsy. If we are going to serve with competence, we must do our utmost to see that the social service programs of our communities are well planned and directed. Planning is the process in which citizens, in cooperation with officials and experts, determine what the needs of the community are and how these needs are to be met. In this process the expert or professional is always "on tap" but he must never be on "top."

In the typical American community, we find a segmentalized group of people. We are divided politically, economically, racially and religiously. We have city planning bodies, Chambers of Commerce, citizen committees for schools, a multiplicity of fund-raising bodies, labor groups, business groups, only to mention a few. We have coordinators to coordinate this, that and something else. If I might be flippant I would say, we need a coordinator to coordinate the coordinators. I have long argued and worked for a new planning unit in our community which would combine the physical, economic, welfare and educational planners of the community. In Altoona, Pennsylvania, this came to fruition in the Altoona Federation, in Pittsburgh it came to fruition in the Allegheny Conference, in Grand Rapids, Michigan, it came to fruition in the Greater Grand Rapids Development Association. This concept of real total planning is not an idle dream. With statesmanship, diligence and devotion, it can be achieved. To plan effectively, we must place the area and its people ahead of our selfish interests. Such an effort calls for a real investment of our time, talent and money. We must sharpen our tools for agreement on priorities. In addition, we must find ways of developing citizen and agency respect and consideration for such priorities once they are agreed upon. It seems as

if this is a basic need if we are to successfully cope with problems emerging in our exploding suburbia. It calls for 1958 top flight statesmanship and the unique ability and willingness to look at the whole picture. Such statesmanship must be coupled with willingness by both operating agencies and citizen leadership to experiment with new patterns of service.

In face of the tremendous need, shortage of personnel and funds, it well might be that the way social work stands up under this need for real, solid and effective planning for the utilization of our resources holds the key to our future opportunity for doing our bit to stabilize the life of our people in these turbulent times with the greatest degree of charity, clarity, competence and cohesion. If we can make progress on this road, we will truly constitute a real force to meet the unknown conditions ahead.

Now, I don't ask you to accept these four convictions of mine. I only ask you to give them your thoughtful consideration as you return to your communities.

I said in the beginning, no one has the answer to the problems posed to us all by our exploding suburban population. My purpose today is to join you in your consideration of this problem and to receive from these deliberations much more than anyone could ever contribute.

At this point, I recall a statement made by Monsignor John A. Ryan at a dinner held for him on his 70th birthday and reported in that excellent book, *Social Doctrine in Action.* Monsignor Ryan said to the assembled group:

> Yes, there has been progress toward social justice in my life time. Those of us who have been active in the movement know that the struggle has been well worthwhile. It has been interesting, zestful, stimulating, soothing to the conscience and sufficiently fruitful to assure us that our labors and efforts have not been in vain.[4]

In regard to the problem of an exploding population with us now and ahead of us, would that when we have reached the scriptural age of three score and ten, we can paraphrase Monsignor Ryan's statement and be able to say:

---

[4] Ryan, Monsignor John A., *Social Doctrine in Action,* Harper & Brothers, New York, N. Y., 1941, p. 280.

> Yes, there has been progress in our social service program, there is greater stability, charity, clarity, competence and cohesion. Those of us who have actively worked on this situation know that the struggle has been worthwhile. It has been interesting, stimulating, soothing to the conscience and sufficiently fruitful to assure us that our labors have not been in vain.

The final thought I would like to leave with you is that when you reduce the problem of social services in an exploding suburbia to its common denominator, you find you have the age-old problem of bringing service to people. The undreamed of growth of this great land of ours only adds a new dimension to this problem. Let us ever remember that the real greatness of our land is not found in its jet speed, skyscrapers, fertile fields and rich deposits of the earth. The real greatness of our country is the greatness of its people, every last one of us, regardless of creed, color or class. The strength of our country is found in the stability of its people; it is spelled out in their physical, spiritual and social well being. Social services as an entity has the skill, know-how and power to make its contribution to this real greatness of our country, namely, its people.

All of us, our clergy, volunteers and professionals, might well read and reread that passage of Pericles which goes as follows:

> Fix your eyes on the greatness of your country as you have it before you day after day, fall in love with her, and when you feel her great, remember that her greatness was won by men with courage, with knowledge of their duty, and with a sense of honour in action, who, even if they failed in some venture, would not think of depriving the country of their powers, but laid them at her feet as their fairest offering.

Summary

WE were a small but mighty group. In this meeting a picture was painted of suburbia presenting increasing problems for business, industry and our social and educational institutions. These problems are not peculiar to any particular section. Specifically we face two general problems: (1) not enough money and (2) not enough personnel. It was the opinion of our United Funds representative, Mr. Smith, that since we are not going to have enough money to finance the services to take care of the needs, we're going to have to do a better job with what we have.

Mr. Rogers, Director of Port Control, Cleveland, outlined the

changes in this community which would result from the opening of the St. Lawrence Seaway. He expects greater movement of population, bringing a newer economy and more intense problems. However, he predicted there would be more money available for services.

Mr. and Mrs. Suburbia were described as a typical American family with financial problems, time problems, etc. Some families in suburbia are facing breakdown very much like the breakdown in families coming to Catholic Charities. Many in suburbia do not know of the services offered by Catholic Charities and there are certain barriers, physical and psychological, which prevent them from seeking help. Our agencies with their present structures have certain barriers which prevent them from serving the suburb dwellers.

We have two alternatives—as a Director put it, "Be quiet and they won't know we're here," or Stand up and be counted—go to the people.

Some suggestions which were made for extending services to suburbia were:

1. Establish branch offices.
2. Assign workers to parishes and schools.
3. Have schools employ social workers.

It was felt we should be able to free the trained workers for more contact with clients and potential clients by:

1. Simplifying our records.
2. Streamlining our statistics.
3. Hiring untrained workers for certain jobs.
4. Evaluating supervision.
5. Having experts do a job analysis and recommend needed changes.

To meet the need for breaking down the barrier which people feel about accepting the services of Catholic Charities, it was suggested that we use existing diocesan organizations to interpret what Catholic Charities does and what is needed for doing an adequate job. This would have a twofold effect: (1) it would get us to the client; (2) it would help us to finance the program.

Fees were discussed and it was felt that some people would prefer to pay for service. We recognized that this subject could not be fully covered at this meeting.—Miss Helen McDaniel, Supervisor, Catholic Welfare Bureau, Columbus, Ohio, *Recorder.*

AMERICAN IMMIGRATION POLICY IN PERSPECTIVE

Chairman: Very Rev. Msgr. A. J. Wycislo, *Assistant Executive Director, Catholic Relief Services—NCWC, New York, N. Y.*

Participant: Robert H. Amundson, Ph.D., *Chairman, Department of Sociology, Loretto Heights College, Loretto Heights, Colo.*

MORE than 40 million immigrants helped build this country from a vast wilderness into one of the most prosperous and productive in the world. The saga of America is a story of the genius and industry of its immigrants. With them they brought wealth, not in terms of money, but in skills, trades, and willingness to work. They have vindicated the belief of our Founding Fathers, that the most important resource of a free nation is *people*. There is scarcely one aspect of our culture, whether it be industry, science, music, law, education, medicine, literature, or labor, which can be discussed without reference to the fundamental contributions of immigrants.

One may well ask how America might have fared if our present discriminatory immigration laws had been in operation during the 19th century. The Scotsman Carnegie, the German Eisenhower, the Frenchman DuPont, the Hungarian Fleischman, the Italian Bellanca, the Russian Sikorsky, the Jew Einstein, the Dane Knudsen—all of these and many more internationally known figures of immigrant status might have failed to meet the standards for admission to this country. For those who are skeptical of the contributions of immigrants and refugees to the welfare of our country, a quick glance at some of the names of those responsible for the successful launching of America's first satellite into orbit might prove convincing—Medaris, von Allen, Zeiler, von Braun, Mrazek, Gruene, Haeussermann, Lindstrom, and Debus.

For nearly 150 years (1776-1921) immigration into the United States was virtually unrestricted. During this time the concept of "free immigration" was supported by a firm conviction that American institutions were intrinsically good and that anyone coming to these shores would immediately feel their impact. In fact this belief was so much a part of the American heritage that at specified times we even solicited immigrants from abroad.

Two general groups of immigrants are usually mentioned when

discussing the era of unregulated immigration into this country: the Old Immigrants from north central and northwestern Europe, who came in large numbers from 1840 to 1890; and the New Immigrants from southern and southeastern Europe, who arrived during the years 1890 to 1920. It is imperative to keep these facts in mind, since the National Origins Law and the McCarran-Walter Act of 1952 are based on the place of birth and the time when these immigrants arrived in this country.

Although immigration was virtually unrestricted from 1776 to 1921, there were attempts to curtail the number of immigrants from time to time, culminating in the Quota Law of 1921 and the subsequent National Origins Law—a law based on fear, false racial theories, outmoded prejudices, and compounded by ignorance. To fully understand the change in attitudes from free immigration to discriminatory legislation, a knowledge of the influence of *nativism* on immigration is imperative.

Nativism is an intense opposition to an internal minority on the grounds of its foreign (and therefore supposedly un-American) connections. It was built upon a triangular base of anti-Catholic, anti-radical, and anti-foreign sentiments, the latter merging into racism in the early years of the 20th century. Although the roots of nativism extend back to the Know Nothing Party and the Native American Party, its real impact as an organized movement against immigration began to be felt shortly after the Civil War.

The decade following the Civil War might aptly be described as an age of optimism. The Germans, Irish, and British continued to arrive in large numbers, along with some Orientals. Nativism at this time was in an embryonic stage, although its presence could be traced to periodic opposition to Irish and German immigrants in selected geographic areas. The age of optimism momentarily hid the presence of nativism. In the 1880's nativists began to question, not the disloyalty of immigrants, but rather the seemingly impossible task of assimilating such diverse groups of people. Initial attempts were made to associate the immigrants with slums, crime, and job stealing. Periodic eruptions, such as the Molly Maguires in the Pennsylvania coal fields and the Hay Market Affair in 1886, confirmed nativist thinking of the immigrant as a lawless person. Specific organizations such as the OUAM (Order of United

American Mechanics) and the APA (American Protective Association) acted as spearheads of the nativist group. The Chinese Exclusion Act and the Contract Labor Law were passed during this time. It is important to note that nativism in the 1880's struck not against *some* immigrants but against *all* immigrants.

In the 1890's nativist influence was extended into the South and West and charges became more specific and flavored with nationalism. In the aftermath of the depression of 1893, fear of the stranger mounted, and hatred and violence erupted more frequently. APA began to exploit myths concerning Catholics, and OUAM activities served to intensify industrial warfare. The "lump of labor" theory advocated by nativists, which described a fixed number of jobs and a static economy, was still not powerful enough, however, to enlist the support of organized labor, whose ranks numbered many immigrants.

It was unfortunate that the new immigrants began to arrive at this time when nativism was beginning to muster its full strength against immigration. Violence in Pennsylvania and New Orleans supported nativist demands for tightening naturalization laws and restricting immigration. The first of many attempts was made to pass the literacy-test law, and immigration was placed wholly under Federal jurisdiction. Nativism suffered a temporary setback in 1897 as business began to pick up and the Spanish-American War loomed on the horizon. Imperialism sparked the notion of automatic assimilation and the melting-pot theory was once again revived.

The early years of the 20th century were marked by a growing fear lest that which was uniquely American be lost as a result of inundation by immigrants. In the vanguard of nativists at this point were the Eastern Patricians who feared the possible diluting of Anglo-Saxon stock. The literacy bill was again introduced, and in 1906 the Naturalization Act was passed to tighten up so-called loopholes in the law.

Early in the 20th century, the anti-foreign base of nativism combined with racism to attempt a revolution of attitudes concerning the nature of man. Racism ultimately became the most important element of nativist ideology. The sources of this ideology were found in the politico-literary emphasis on the Anglo-Saxon tradition and in the pseudo-scientific writings of de Gobineau, Ripley, Chamberlain, Grant, and Stoddard. The

terms *race* and *culture* were blurred into one distorted concept. The labeling of immigrants from southern and southeastern Europe as innately inferior sharpened race thinking. As the new immigrants continued to arrive in large numbers (over one million in 1907), demands for restriction became more vocal. The literacy bill was once again revived, the Gentleman's Agreement was activated, and an Immigration Commission was appointed to study the problem. Its report, submitted in 1911 in some 40-odd volumes, favored restriction and supported the literacy bill, which was finally passed over President Wilson's veto in 1917. Anti-radical and anti-Catholic sentiment was revived as the summit of pre-war nativism was reached in 1914. The KKK (Ku Klux Klan) rose up in 1915 to wield the cudgel of bigotry against foreigners, Catholics, Negroes, and Jews. Organized labor still opposed immigration restriction, but its resistance was not as vocal as in the preceding decades.

Continued agitation for stricter laws governing immigration following World War I stemmed from a number of diverse sources — isolationist attitudes following the war, increased pressure from the KKK, the writings of racists, Grant and Stoddard, and the depression in the mid-1920s—resulting in our first quota law in 1921. This law established a quota of 3% of the foreign born of each nationality group resident in the U.S., according to the census of 1910. It established a national quota system based on the pre-existing composition of the American population. This law marked a turning point in American immigration policy. The 1921 law was extended for three years in the wake of rumors that waves of immigrants were about to descend like locusts on the U.S., if the law lapsed after one year. Organized labor finally succumbed to nativistic pressures and openly favored immigration restriction. In all fairness, however, it must be stated that this was a temporary and unfamiliar role for organized labor to play. At the present time the AFL-CIO is on record as opposing the present discriminatory immigration laws of this country. Their position is a realistic one which recognizes the fact that some local labor problems will have to be solved, but also recognizes the fact that a dynamic and expanding American economy can easily absorb many more immigrants than are now allowed to enter this country.

In 1924 the National Origins principle was passed into law. It reduced the quota to 2% and employed the census of 1890. In 1929 the law became a permanent feature of our immigration policy and the quota was raised to 3% and the census date advanced to 1920. However, the damage had already been done, since the numbers of southern Europeans had already been drastically reduced by the quota laws of 1921 and 1924.

The National Origins law was designed to discriminate on the basis of national origin, race, and color. The test applied was not the individual worth of the immigrant but the presumed superiority of people from certain geographic areas. The fundamental assumption of the National Origins laws was that the place of birth of prospective immigrants was a reliable index of their possible contribution to the U.S. and the likelihood of their becoming good citizens. The National Origins law was based on fear of and hostility toward strangers and on false assumptions unsubstantiated by biology, history, sociology, economics, or anthropology.

The quota laws purported to fix immigration quotas on the basis of the national origins of our population. However, the quotas are based on the national origins of our population in 1920, not in 1950, and they exclude Negroes, Indians, and other non-whites from the population base. The quota laws thus assume that American culture had reached a fixed plateau in 1920 and future policy must perpetuate a fixed racial constitution.

History has recorded the failure of the National Origins law to achieve its primary objective: to channel immigration in accordance with a statistical pattern. Since 1924 only 44% of the allotted quotas have been used. Furthermore, of all quota immigrants from 1930 to 1951, 42% came from south and southeastern Europe. According to the National Origins principle, only 16% should have come from this part of Europe. The law failed, first, because the favored quota countries did not send immigrants in proportion to their quotas; second, because it did not apply to non-quota immigration which between 1930 and 1951 was substantial (820,795); and third, because the system was so rigid and inflexible that in emergencies Congress had to pass special legislation and ignore the National Origins principle.

The validity of the National Origins law was rarely questioned during the period from 1929 to the passage of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952. Even the immigrants most affected by discrimination made little protest, remembering the hostile reactions of such groups as the KKK in the aftermath of World War I.

Sudden crises beginning in the 1930's however, combined with the inability of the National Origins law to provide for a "right of asylum," necessitated a series of hurried, piecemeal, and fragmentary legislation. (Of course, you who have worked with the Displaced Persons and the more recent refugees are very familiar with these special programs. Under the provisions of the Refugee Act in the 1930's some 243,862 immigrants were admitted as refugees from Nazi tyranny. World War II witnessed a virtual end to immigration from 1941 to 1945. The Chinese Exclusion Act was repealed in 1943, probably as a gesture of good will toward the Chinese, one of our allies in World War II.

Beginning in 1946 demands for additional labor began to mount and the Displaced Persons Act was passed in 1948. Under the provisions of this Act, made somewhat more workable as a result of amendments in 1950, 393,542 Europeans, rendered homeless by World War II or who could not with safety remain or return to pre-war communities, were allowed to enter the U.S. between 1948 and 1952.

Suddenly, after quiet and unobtrusive work, the McCarran-Walter Act was catapulted into prominence as a new immigration law. This law, however, is nothing more than a carbon copy of the 1924 law, with a few minor exceptions. Like the previous one, it is not concerned with the personal worth of the immigrant but rather with his place of birth. It too discriminates on the basis of national origin, race, and color. The basic provisions for assigning quotas remain essentially unchanged. Under the present law the number of immigrants to be admitted annually is 154,000. This is approximately equal to 1/6 of 1% of the total *white* population of the U.S. in 1920. The few positive features of the 1952 law can be described briefly but completely as the codification of existing immigration laws and the assigning of minimum quotas to Oriental countries.

The shortcomings of the McCarran-Walter Act are perhaps very familiar to many of you. Some of the more obvious discriminatory features are these:

1. Flagrant violation of due process of law.
2. Double examination of the immigrant by the Department of State and again by the Department of Justice.
3. Abolishing statutes of limitation in deportation cases and making grounds for deportation retroactive.
4. Eliminating teachers and scientists from the non-quota group.
5. Permitting the opinion of a consular official to be the final word on the barring of immigrants who are *likely* to become public charges.
6. Eliminating judicial review of deportation cases in many instances.
7. Depriving American citizens of the right to be immune from search or official interrogation without a warrant.
8. Requiring rigid tests for admission of skilled or unskilled workers.
9. Requiring deportation of immigrants who become addicted to narcotics *after* entry.
10. Establishing a special inferior status for persons of Asiatic extraction, including Filipinos.

Several unsuccessful attempts have been made to amend the 1952 law. The Truman (Perlman) Commission, appointed in the fall of 1952, submitted many recommendations for changes, none of which ever achieved fruition. This committee report is a thorough, detailed, and reasoned analysis of an unreasonable and unworkable law. Several bills have been introduced during both Eisenhower administrations in an effort to amend the law —e.g., the Ives-Javits bill, the Lehman bill, the Celler bill. None of these has succeeded, although the Kennedy amendment passed in the fall of 1957 did somehow manage to do the impossible. Some of the proposals which are deemed essential in making the McCarran-Walter Act a reasonable and workable law are these:

1. Liberalization of Oriental quotas.
2. Consolidation of agencies in order to eliminate the double examination of immigrants.

3. A vigorous review of present policies that violate due process of law.
4. Establishing a single, unified quota of 1/6 of 1% of the total population of the U.S., based on current census data, including Negroes and Indians.
5. Transfer of present and future unused quotas to countries which have used up their quotas or already mortgaged them into the future.
6. A permanent though flexible provision of our basic immigration law to include the right of asylum for expellees and refugees. This would eliminate the need for periodic and piecemeal emergency legislation.

Just as the Refugee Act and the DP Act were made necessary because of the rigidity of the National Origins law, so the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 and the Presidential Order affecting Hungarians in 1956 were made necessary because of the inflexibility of the McCarran-Walter Act.

The Refugee Relief Act of 1953 hardly justified the cost of passing it. It approved the admission of 209,000 over a period of three years and eight months. The law was made inoperative when it was inundated with so-called security measures. During the first nine months of its operation only eight persons entered the U.S.; two of these were orphans.

There is much discussion today in the streets of America and in both academic and political circles concerning the present and future status of Hungarian refugees under the McCarran-Walter Act. Hungary was given a quota of 865 immigrants per year under the 1952 law. This quota was to be used by Hungarian immigrants, however, not by Hungarian refugees. The McCarran-Walter Act could not handle the mass exodus from Hungary because since 1924 the "right of asylum" has been eliminated as a basic feature of our immigration laws. The 65,000 Hungarian refugees this country has promised to accept are admitted on the strength of a Presidential Order and under the "parolee provision" of the McCarran-Walter Act. The "parolee provision," however, was designed to admit *individual* refugees, not *groups,* thus pointing up once again the inadequacy of the existing law in meeting emergencies of this type. Under the "parolee provision" the refugees are allowed to remain in the U.S. under rigorous scrutiny and constant investigation by the

FBI, but cannot become citizens. Have we really convinced the Hungarians in this way that we know what freedom means to them and that we are willing to offer opportunities to people courageous enough to leave their ancestral homelands to search for liberty?

The Kennedy amendment is the only successful attempt to breach the McCarran-Walter Act. Passed in the fall of 1957, it makes provisions for reuniting families, adoption entries, and admission of orphans. At least the McCarran-Walter Act has not proved itself *totally* invulnerable to the scrutiny of logical analysis.

Although our present immigration law is basically a discriminatory one, the U.S. has not ignored the problems of international population pressure, migration, and resettlement. The U.S., by participating in the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration (ICEM), the U.S. Escapee Program (USEP), and the program of the U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees, has recognized the importance of cooperation at the international level.

ICEM, organized in Brussels in 1951, is concerned with refugees as well as nationals from overcrowded European countries. It is set up outside the framework of the United Nations, but works closely with it and with other international agencies, such as the International Catholic Migration Commission, whose activities affect migration. In 1956 ICEM settled 172,172 migrants, including 55,000 Hungarian refugees.

The U.S. Escapee Program, organized on March 22, 1952, has as its chief objective the resettlement of escapees from behind the Iron Curtain in the free countries of the West. Its activities include counseling, vocational guidance, language training, remedial medical and dental care, basic food rations, clothing, bedding, lodging, and visa processing. The cost of transportation is shared jointly by USEP and ICEM. Since 1952 over 50,000 escapees have been aided by USEP. The accomplishments of USEP are a concrete demonstration of the friendship of the free world for the people of the Soviet-dominated countries, and help to counteract Soviet propaganda that the West has no regard for their distress.

The office of the U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees was established by the General Assembly on January 1, 1951, and

was renewed by mandate until December, 1958. It has two functions: 1. To provide international protection for refugees; 2. To promote activities designed to aid voluntary repatriation of refugees or their assimilation within new national communities.

On January 1, 1957, there were one million refugees within the High Commissioner Mandate in Europe and 750,000 to 800,000 in other parts of the world. Many voluntary agencies, Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish, aid this agency. On May 1, 1957, 71,929 Hungarian refugees had been moved from Austria to 15 European countries; 62,224 had been moved to 17 overseas countries of resettlement; 4,462 were voluntarily repatriated to Hungary; and 35,534 were still in Austria. These three programs—USEP, ICEM, and UNHCR — furnish some concrete evidence that escapees and refugees are not completely ignored by the free countries of the world.

More than half the world's total population lives on the continent of Asia. How can we convince these 1.5 billions of people that our intentions are honorable in seeking world peace if we continue to maintain discriminatory immigration barriers based on national origin, race, and color? To maintain some of the Asian countries within the orbit of the free world calls for a drastic revision of present immigration policies. It seems strange that the designers and supporters of our present immigration law do not see the possible dangers resulting from its present entrenchment behind arguments smacking of national sovereignty and the exclusive character of national interests. Since western democracies are founded on the Judaeo-Christian tradition emphasizing the worth and dignity of the individual person, to continue to maintain discriminatory immigration barriers is to violate the very tenets on which democracy is based.

We cannot and do not wish to return to an era of unregulated and unrestricted immigration. There is a difference, however, between immigration restriction and immigration discrimination: there is an ethical basis for the former, but not for the latter. No individual should be placed in the position of being forced to choose between unregulated immigration on the one hand, and the McCarran-Walter Act on the other.

Our present immigration law poses a serious threat to the democratic ideals expressed by our Founding Fathers. It questions whether we still respect minority rights as well as majority

rule. It differentiates those who believe in the future of America from those who think in terms of a static economy and a maximum population. It reflects a type of fear and insecurity which is inconsistent with confident world leadership. The history of immigration proves that the United States can have great cultural diversity within an overriding national unity. We cannot continue to extol the doctrines of the equality of man, the defense of civil rights, and an equitable legal system when our present immigration law negates them in practice. In these troubled times the greatness of the United States will be judged according to the degree in which it honors its democratic ideals by aiding those who ask only for an opportunity to contribute to the American heritage of freedom based on the dignity of man.

THE REFUGEE AND U.S. LEGISLATION

Chairman: Very Rev. Msgr. A. J. Wycislo, *Assistant Executive Director, Catholic Relief Services—NCWC, New York, N. Y.*

Participants: 1. Very Rev. Msgr. Thomas J. Rilley, *Director, Catholic Resettlement Council, Philadelphia, Pa.*

LOOKING back over the refugee program from the year 1951 to the present date, I would like to give you briefly some of the practical situations which we have encountered in settling these people from foreign lands. My worthy participants in this discussion, Mr. Pierce Gerety and Mr. Charles O' Neill, will take up other aspects of this problem.

In 1951 there was a great deal of enthusiasm on the part of the Church, the Diocesan Directors of Catholic Charities, nationality organizations, parishes in trying to resettle these people outside their own homeland. This carried on—this enthusiasm—for sometime. Homes were available, job opportunities were presented, people wanted to do their part; the Church wanted to take an active part in social work in this particular field in order that we might let it be known to the other organizations that we were interested in our brothers around the globe.

Later the charity, the kindness, the zeal lost its emphasis, and a few years back, when trying to settle a refugee or displaced person or an escapee, we had to dig deep to find a home and

a job and the opportunities that they needed. It was, "What do I give and how much do I receive for my help?" It was a situation where the refugee had to be needed as much as the home and job were needed. Sometimes there was a wrangle over the actual cash payments but these were, in most cases, agreeably solved. Just previous to the Hungarian dispute and the coming of the Hungarian refugees to the United States, we were confronted with the problem which was brought about by the Labor Department or the labor leaders of the United States. The tailoring industry found that they did not have a suitable number of people coming up through the ranks to learn tailoring, then go into the plants, such as Hickey-Freeman and others, Botany Clothes, Darroff Manufacturing and similar concerns that have large tailoring plants for men's clothing.

Then came the Triestini—mostly Italians—and they came in great numbers to be settled. We were successful in giving them the opportunities that they needed because the job opportunity was so pressing at the moment that they were willing to take any kind of housing in order to begin immediately to work. This was a different type of participation on the part of our Refugee Relief Program in the sense that after the refugees were working for a few weeks, then we had to try to get them better housing and other things that they needed, but for them the job was paramount. With other people, it was their relationship to the community or to their relatives which counted most—the job was secondary.

Then came the Hungarian Refugee Program and all of you know very well what a difficult thing that was—the type of people that came—and the great numbers in which they came and their dissatisfaction with America. I think they came here with resentment because we as a Government did not help them sufficiently when they started the revolt and they were promised help. Be that as it may, our job was not to pacify them or try to explain to them our position as a Government; our job, as Directors, and people working with the Diocesan Charities Office, was to get them settled as quickly as possible. This proved to be a most difficult group in the sense that they were much younger—probably they did not have the capabilities of the other refugees and displaced persons coming to this

country, plus the fact that they expected the American young people to accept them as Freedom Fighters. Our young American people did not understand what these young people of Hungary had gone through. We, older citizens, could understand in view of the experience that we had, reading a great deal in history, and particularly in the history of the Church.

The Hungarian group was not satisfied with the type of jobs that were offered to them; they would quit without any provocation; they would come back to the Diocesan Office to seek help. We also had a serious moral problem with the young Hungarian girls. They were a most difficult group; however, we feel very fortunate in the numbers that we were able to settle.

Now throughout this whole picture, the Hungarians, the Triestini, the early displaced persons and refugees who came, there was a great deal of difficulty in the sense that our own people, our own Catholic nationality groups who wanted to assist, did not know how to assist and went off on their own tangents and sometimes gave us a great deal of trouble. If everything went smoothly and there were homes and jobs for them, that was fine, but when difficulties came up, where there was need of counseling or guidance, medical care or dental care, or funerals to be taken care of, then they came back to the Diocesan Office.

We should have worked with these people when they had difficulties previous to their coming to us as an emergency group. I think in the last or in the Hungarian situation, we did not have a real idea of the problems that were going to confront us. We had a serious problem when these people were dumped in Camp Mercy or Camp Kilmer as it was called, and the personnel there allowed visitors to come in with just a pass which they could secure from the Army Post; they came in and talked to as many Hungarians as they desired, and if they felt that they could be of some service to them, they would take these people out. We would not be aware that they were in our Diocese or our city. I know that you were confronted with this problem if you lived near the Camp.

Then there were the national Hungarian organizations that took these people out of camp wholesale, because they wanted to do something for this great mass of people which had come

to the United States. In taking them out wholesale, they did not have sufficient jobs, or homes for them; they thought they were going to get help from their own people, members of their organizations which they failed to do, and when things got difficult and their treasury was exhausted, then they appealed to the Diocese to help them. This we did, because we were fortunate to have in the Diocese one or two Hungarian institutions where we were able to get help, where we were able to place young people.

I think we were not geared to the idea or perhaps we did not think it was part of the work of War Relief Services—NCWC to settle and resettle these youngsters who came over at age 14 to 17—the Hungarian Freedom Fighters. They had a misconception and I know that we are not responsible for this nor is the Church responsible; perhaps no one was responsible; it was just a situation which developed and we could not do much about it. But when these young people came from Hungary their idea of America was very warped, let us say. Talking to them, we found they wanted to go to California, they wanted to see Hollywood, they wanted to see Texas, they wanted to see Florida. They were not willing to settle down; they thought they were going to be feated as great people, which they are; they fought for freedom; they tried to preserve life for the people in Hungary. We recognize and admit that they are wonderful people but at the same time if they were going to be resettled here, it was up to us to try to work them into the American way of life rather quickly so that they could adjust themselves and become good and active citizens.

Now one other situation, and I am just going to touch on this briefly because I know Mr. Gerety has said or will say more about it, that is the situation of the parolee — the Hungarian parolee. He is not psychologically secure in this country. Oh, he has a job; he has a home; he has all the obligations and duties to perform toward this country, but he was never quite sure that he was going to be a citizen because he was on this parolee basis. I do not know the situation as of the moment—I have not kept up with it, but Mr. Gerety certainly could explain that to us and if they are off the parolee status and are going to become citizens of this country, well

and good, but if they are not and they are still on the parolee status, it makes it difficult for them to adjust.

Now the refugees, the displaced persons and the Hungarians who have come over and settled here and who have been successful—these people are a credit to us and the Church; they are a credit to the community in which they live. They are frugal people; they appreciate the most important things in life, their freedom, their right to worship, family life; they try to have, as we all have, an ideal, viz., we should make this country a better place in which to live or we should give our children a better opportunity than we had. The standard of civilization has been raised through that ideal. This is history which you all know about—the history of mankind. Now these people who have been successful, have provided the opportunities for their children to get the finest in life. Those who have been unsuccessful in the sense that they do not have security, they do not have the proper means to get an education and the like—they are the ones that are on the fringe, that give us the possible difficulties. They wander from one agency to another seeking whatever help they may be able to get—the International Institute, the Health and Welfare Councils, your Family Service, all the other agencies that in the beginning of this program volunteered their services to displaced persons. However, when relief has to be given out over a period of time or a long-range plan has to be made and these agencies, either due to lack of personnel or lack of interest in a particular case, turn it over to War Relief Services—NCWC, then we have to spend much time to get all the details of the case.

A great many people came through the Hungarian situation to Camp Kilmer and they were released through other agencies because our Catholic agency and the NCWC office in Camp Kilmer were overcrowded. I personally saw and heard agency people who would come up to the long lines of refugees standing before the Catholic desk to be screened and would say to them, "We have help over here." It might be the Church World Service, or HYIAS, or some other group that wanted to help as much as they could. The Hungarians were getting quite upset, naturally, staying in Camp and not seeing anything outside the Camp—barbed wire all around the Camp. They would say, "When do we see America? When do we get started?" When long lines kept

our Catholic refugees back, some of them went over to other agencies and were placed through them.

Now when these people got into difficulties, they went back to the agency and the agency explained immediately that they came through N.C.W.C. We had nothing to do with it; N.C.W.C. is only the badge under which they came out of Hungary, over to Camp Kilmer but we, as N.C.W.C., did not have anything to do with placing them, so we had to go back to the sponsors and try to find out how many of these people had a valid sponsorship. Of course, practically speaking, if they didn't have it, we had to take care of them.

The situation, as its stands at the moment, is that most of the refugees have been settled securely, their children are attending Catholic schools, they are a credit to our school system and strangely enough, some of the young people who came in, some of the Hungarians and some of the Czechs that came on the refugee program, and whom we placed in ordinary tasks such as housekeepers, domestics, and handymen or farmers, and people like that—these people and the members of their families are now in gainful employment—some of them in semi-professional jobs, and the girls, most of them, in office jobs. It is gratifying to see them when they come back to the office and say that they are working for some utility or transportation, or some law office or some type of work like that.

One of the big questions, of course, that we, as priests, always think about and rightfully so, is, "How will these people fit into the Catholic Church as members of parishes and organizations?" Where there is a strong nationality group, there is no problem in getting them to join up socially and culturally with that group. The Hungarians, and I had better not single out any particular group, but say the whole group of refugees, by a vast majority, do attend church services, that is, they come to Mass, receive the Sacraments and the like, and they do participate in church organizations. There are a few, such as are found in any group, that will not go to church. Our difficulty at the moment is to make sure that the refugee children attend our Catholic schools, not only to get a religious education and background but more particularly to make them strong adherents to the Church so that they will not be weaned away by any organization or any group which offers them free services. Now the

difficulty in getting those children into our Catholic schools is that our schools, as private schools, not supported by taxes, have to be supported by the people of the parish, and the refugee looks at this from a very practical standpoint. He says to himself, "Well, over on the other side there were State schools and they were free schools; here American offers me free school education for my children; the Catholic school says that I have to pay tuition; I have to buy books; I have to do this; I have to do that." It is up to us priests to acquaint them with our Catholic school system and show them the importance, the real importance of getting their children into a Catholic school. There are other difficulties, especially for the children of refugees who, because of language difficulties or just their inability to participate in American ways with other children, find that they are being sought after by particular groups, sectarian and non-sectarian groups, that try to get them into a youth movement. I think that our CYO's throughout the country have done an excellent job in trying to bring into their groups these refugees who have come over. They have tried to absorb them—not only to absorb them but to ask them to give to our American children something of the country in which they were brought up. As you probably know, the Boy Scout movement, as soon as the refugees came, began a campaign to get these youngers into various troops. Many sections of the country have their own particular refugee group or displaced persons' Scout Troops. A Scout Troop made up of only displaced children was not a success; it was the integrated groups that were successful.

What are some of the problems that confront new people coming into this country? The refugee or displaced person or escapee or any person emigrating to the United States is going to be faced with some problem. Over the past few years, there have been good and bad people among the groups coming into the United States. By good people I mean those who were kind and considerate and ready to accept almost anything in order to become citizens of the United States. The other group, the bad group, were those who were difficult to settle, difficult to reason with, people who sought help at every instant and who did not want to accept the type of jobs that were presented to them here in the United States.

The work of the Refugee Relief program or the NCWC program for people coming into our section of the country has not stopped; we still get inquiries for help; some few people of the Hungarian group are still coming to us, seeking help. The young people who came through the International Rescue Committee and who are now attending our Catholic colleges in the area have to be helped during the summer months and off-school hours. Beyond that situation, I think that the people in the Philadelphia area would be willing and ready to accept other refugees or displaced persons or escapees. Why do I say that? For this reason: We had a great number come and a great number settled, and while some of the charity and the zeal that went into trying to help these newcomers has gone, our people look at the situation now with a rather serious view and some with a critical eye. Since our large cities, our metropolitan areas are melting places for all nationality groups, and they all contribute something to our American way of life, the average American today is willing to give his fellow European cousin the opportunity to make the same progress that he himself is making here in this country.

We would be willing to accept placements of any people coming into our country, if we could get sufficient notice of the type of person that is coming, and opportunity to work with him on a fair scale, and cooperation from the labor people of the area, who often in the past have promised that they would help us and when the time came they were found lacking; also let the nationality groups look after their own people in a practical sense, and see that the planning they do is done through the Diocesan Office; the follow-up of these people, should not be through other agencies, but through our own agency, so that we can find out where help is needed before they come to us on an emergency basis.

I think one of the real important features of this whole program is to try to get the press of our own area to give us a fair break. Remember the treatment we got in the beginning of the Refugee Relief Program and the Escapee Program. In the East the press gave us great praise and helped us in every situation where we needed help -they were very kind and gracious to us. Came the Hungarian Revolution, and the Hungarians began to come to the country, I guess our press did not know

what type of people to expect; they gave us a bad break in many instances, after they talked to the first group of people that came—The Intelligentsia as they were called, the select group of Hungarians who came by plane to our American soil. The press went all out and interviewed them and because some person among them had a new traveling bag or what looked like a fairly new suit of clothes, they were criticized severely. When we really needed the help of the press in the weeks that followed, when the average Hungarian Freedom Fighter and escapee from Austria who had tried to gather up his family as best he could, came to this country seeking help and recognition and the opportunity to live, the press did not give us the help and the assistance that we needed.

Our television programs showed the Hungarian Fighters and gave us a pretty good picture of them; they were not the type of persons that the American people expected to come to this country, the poorer class of people, such as came during the Displaced Persons Program when they were still wearing their native clothes and all their possessions were in bags—country folks, laborers, et cetera. When the Hungarians came, the people portrayed on television, on radio, and in the publicity pictures were well dressed, intelligent looking and the American public just could not accept them as Hungarian refugees, emphasis on refugees. However, I think now we have learned more and thought more about the Hungarian situation and know that it was the leaders of the Hungarian Revolt that we were confronted with, as well as the refugees who fought as Freedom Fighters. And when we think now about Czecho-Slovakia or any place else where the same thing could happen overnight, I believe that our American people would be ready to accept them. I feel sure that the Diocesan Directors who are interested in this particular program, have a better idea of what to expect from any European group now than they had six years ago. At that time we were so busy trying to find homes and jobs and screening these refugees and displaced persons that we did not have a chance to sit down and figure out the total effect this was going to have upon a community or upon the refugees or upon the Church. But now looking back at it, in retrospect, we know the problems, we know how to face the problems and should more people come, and we hope they will, we will be able to do a much better job in assisting them.

I think the knowledge and experience, gained through our participation in this program would now enable us to know where our resources are, where we can expect cooperation, as well as the type of people coming in. The Diocesan group thus would be able to extend a very fine program to the displaced persons to be settled.

2. Charles A. O'Neill, *Executive Secretary*
Society of St. Vincent de Paul, Milwaukee, Wis.

AS I look over the last decade and reflect on our experience in the resettlement of displaced persons and refugees, I ask myself several questions:

1. Have we really helped the refugee?
2. Have the refugees resettled in the Milwaukee area made good? Did they appreciate the opportunity of coming to the United States? What about their integration—their religious life?
3. What has been the attitude of people of our community toward the refugee, toward our Society and the Church for assisting in this program? Good or bad?
4. What about the future? Is what we have done such that the people of our community will continue to be favorable to our general immigration program?

There are other questions but if I can answer some of these I may at the same time relate our experience to the general topic under consideration at this meeting.

First of all I am convinced that we have really helped the refugee. I had the privilege of visiting refugee camps in Germany and Austria. I have sensed, as most of you have, that for the most part the refugees brought to this country since 1948 would have had a hopeless life without the opportunity of emigration. Then, too, as we have observed the refugee in his new home and on the job, we could not help but notice that he made the most of his opportunity and quickly entered into the stream of American life; so much so that after a few years neighbors and fellow workers fully accepted him.

I am further convinced that whatever success we have had is not only due to the kind of people resettled but to the careful and efficient way in which this whole resettlement program has been administered. I have noticed that whenever there is a

deviation from the definite requirements and policies established by the Government, and the agencies licensed to work in this field, problems mount. I mean requirements such as a good sponsor, home and job. Even in the so-called crash program for Hungarian refugees in our Archdiocese, we adhered to the same type of program as we did for other refugees. We agreed to accept only those for whom we had verified homes and jobs. Of course, due to emergency, we speeded up the process but we still used the same criteria. In that connection, may I say that even during the present recession we have not had to refer Hungarian refugees for public assistance. Those who lost their jobs, and there were many, either found new jobs or, in the case of families, the wife secured a job.

Perhaps it would be well here to set forth more specifically our experience with all refugees starting with employment.

1. *Employment* has not been a problem excepting during the recessions of '53-'54 and '57-'58. Most of the refugees arrived during the years when employment opportunities were very good. Large industries, such as Allis-Chalmers, Harnischfeger Corp., Nordberg, Kearney-Trecker and Chain Belt, hired many skilled and unskilled workers and speak highly of the refugees still in their employ. No one industry has had a large percentage of refugees. Smaller firms possibly have taken more refugees than the heavy industries, especially in unskilled classifications. There are a number employed as oilers, sweepers and on other unskilled jobs. Hospitals have hired many of the older refugees. There was a time when hospitals were very short-handed in maintenance departments and porter work. Refugees have met a real need in hospital work. Bakeries hired a large number, especially Hungarians, in both skilled and unskilled jobs. Young and older people alike have kept their jobs and are well liked. The meat industry has hired many Polish, Jugoslav, Ethnic German and Hungarian refugees and report that the turnover is relatively small. In two instances known to me, men so employed saved enough money to set up their own meat markets. In one instance the meat market established in an industrial area of Cudahy is doing very well. In the other, the refugee made a mistake in selecting a shop in a fairly well established neighborhood where most of the shopping is done in supermarkets. Our enterprising refugee lost most of his investment but fortunately was welcomed

back to his job in the meat packing company. I dare say that he will save more money and try another business venture in a few years. Isn't this typically American?

Other jobs given refugees have been in construction, building trades, leather factories, auto mechanics, hotel and restaurant work, etc. Our Salvage Bureau has been most helpful in offering short-time jobs to a number of refugees.

2. *Housing* has never been a problem. At the present time landlords are offering reasonable rentals and in many instances specifically asking for refugees. They say, "The refugees are neat and they pay rent regularly."

3. *Language* is sometimes a problem at the outset but given a few months most refugees speak English very well. I have been impressed with their earnest desire to learn our language. The Hungarian refugees were given special courses at Marquette University and St. Emeric Hungarian Catholic Church to supplement courses offered by the vocational school and social centers for all refugees. It would be helpful if refugees could have some knowledge of English before they emigrated. I realize this has not always been possible.

4. *Education.* Children have adjusted well in both public and parochial schools. I have yet to hear of one who failed but I have heard of many who are at the top of their classes. As far as adults are concerned, they have been eager to take night courses at the vocational schools and opportunity schools. Many have finished courses in bookkeeping, various trades, etc., and secured better jobs or advancement on present jobs because of such training.

5. *Health.* Only a few children and adults have presented serious physical and mental health problems; in fact, a smaller percentage than a comparable segment of our general population. This no doubt speaks well for the careful screening done overseas.

6. *Casework Service.* The refugees have needed professional casework service and particularly the friendly visiting and counseling of the volunteer Vincentians on the parish level. I cannot conceive of any good resettlement program without a tie-up with an agency offering both professional and volunteer service. Furthermore, I cannot conceive of a good program without

Charity. Surely Charity is the core of our program, coupled with prudent, experienced, and dedicated personnel. We take it for granted that the newcomer resettled by N.C.W.C., with our approval, is our responsibility. The difficulty we have had, I must say, has frequently been due to some well-intentioned nationality groups promoting sponsorships, bringing refugees to a large city, and not following up or offering any service. I would urge that in the future only responsible agencies that are ready and willing to follow up cases, and have the organization to do so, be given the responsibility of approving sponsor applications.

Under this heading of casework service we must recognize the valuable services given by other agencies including the Health Department and Visiting Nurses, School Welfare workers, State Employment counselors and others who help in specialized areas. Most important, however, is the patient, understanding parish priest who is concerned not only with the religious life of the refugee in his parish but also is helpful on many of the problems in his individual and family life.

7. *Community Reactions.* I think that as a whole community reactions have been most favorable to the refugee, to the agency, and to the Church. We worked quietly the last 10 years, carefully resettling more than 4,000 refugees in the Milwaukee area. There was scarcely a news story until the Hungarian crisis. Then it was news. We thought at first the publicity might be harmful to our entire program. The contrary was true. Thousands of people who had never heard of the Society of St. Vincent de Paul not only became interested in what we were doing for refugees but wanted to know about the Society. It took careful handling. Some people thought at first that we were spending all our funds on refugees. We had plenty of opportunity of interpreting the fact that only some $10,000, all contributed specially for this purpose, was expended out of about $500,000 spent by the Society in Milwaukee yearly for other charitable purposes. Of course, there were some complaints. Every once in a while someone would call and say, "You get jobs for the Hungarians. Why don't you get an American a job?" We were always careful to interpret how the Society worked with sponsors and that we did not go out seeking jobs. We always offered to give the caller whatever help we could and in many instances referred such applicants to jobs originally offered for refugees. I can

truthfully say that for every complaint there were thousands of compliments for the leadership taken by the Church for Hungarians. Protestants and Catholics alike wrote favorable letters to the newspapers. Radio, television and the press did a tremendous job which left a very good impression.

8. *The Future.* Based on the contribution made and being made by refugees to America and based on general community reactions toward the refugees during the past 10 years, I would say that the people are favorable to our general immigration policy. I think, however, that we must recognize that the number who can secure gainful employment will rise and fall with our economic conditions. I think it is important to go along with the times. When there is a recession and job opportunities are scarce, we will naturally approve fewer applications than in periods of full employment.

Surely we should make more sacrifices and do much more than we are doing for unfortunate refugees and other people of overcrowded countries. We should not feel smug and say that we are doing enough. We are not. We should, however, continue to do everything in such a way that we really help the refugee, the Church and our country.

3. Pierce J. Gerety, *Attorney, New York City; Former Deputy Administrator for Refugee Programs, U.S. Department of State*

WHEN I first stepped apprehensively into the highly charged atmosphere that surrounded the office of the Refugee Relief Program in Washington in 1955, the voluntary agencies were, to me, merely the villains whose thirst for the scalps of public officials could never be quenched. I soon learned that most of them are willing to bury the tomahawk whenever the public officials concerned buckle down to doing an effective job. Before I was through, I discovered that no really effective job can be done for the relief of refugees without the help of the voluntary agencies. Governments and international organizations can merely help the voluntary agencies, they can never supplant them.

This was probably never more dramatically demonstrated than during the Hungarian crisis. In those crucial days, when thousands of people fled into neutral Austria, the voluntary agencies were there within hours to help feed them, clothe them, shelter

them, and make a start on their problems of resettlement and readjustment.

It was because there were such organizations on the spot with staff and know-how, that the government agencies and international organizations were able to avoid complete chaos and to achieve a reasonably swift and satisfactory solution.

This is not to say that there were not heroes, too, among the ranks of the official governmental and inter-governmental organizations. There were many of them. But very little would have been accomplished without the voluntary religious welfare agencies.

It seemed to me—and I am sure to most observers—during those days and nights, everywhere from the bordertown of Andau to Vienna, that this was a remarkable demonstration of unselfish cooperation among numerous religious agencies, that this was charity at its best, with everyone helping and never a question about whether a poor unfortunate was Jew or Gentile or Unbeliever.

What a pity that the author of the one popular American eye-witness account which the episode produced went out of his way to spread the slander in his book that the United States Government, with the cooperation of these voluntary agencies, was applying a religious test to refugees seeking to come to the United States. The Government never had a religious test, and the religious agencies, which were the only ones on the spot and in a position to be immediately effective, waived any religious tests.

It was, it seems to me, only natural that the religious welfare agencies should be an important factor in solving that emergency, both in preliminary assistance abroad and in permanent resettlement here, because they are the only agencies that have permanent operating organizations working among the displaced people overseas and providing the guidance and material help that is needed in the countries of resettlement.

In their concern for the poor, the hungry, the homeless and the disturbed, these religious agencies have a continuity of purpose and a zeal that is capable of surmounting all obstacles. Unfortunately, in both governmental and non-governmental refugee work, we struggle through from crisis to crisis, improvising solutions that are never carefully thought

out, and almost always the refugee crisis becomes the springboard for new attacks on our restrictive immigration laws.

It occurs to me that if revision of our immigration laws depends upon the pressure of a refugee crisis, and the solution of the various refugee problems depends upon the revision of U.S. immigration laws, we are not going to achieve much in either field.

In the State Department I was officially concerned with both of these problems. My bureau was working on several fronts. We were administering the program that the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 authorized, the resettlement of some 200,000 refugees in the United States of America; we were administering the United States Escapee Program, which concerned itself with assistance and resettlement for a particular class of Iron-Curtain refugees; we were participating on behalf of the United States in the activities of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration, which is concerned with the movement of refugees from Europe.

At the same time, another area of the Department was responsible for our support of the program of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, that is concerned with Iron-Curtain refugees and stateless refugees; and still another area of the Department was working with the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees. At the same time, many of the same people were trying to come up with some new ideas for the rewriting of the McCarran-Walter Act.

To me, this multiplicity of activities and agencies was a never-ending source of confusion, and it soon became apparent that it was a source of confusion to the Bureau of the Budget, which has a veto power on the money. If you read the separate justifications for funds for some of these separate activities, you might suppose you were reading and re-reading the same document.

I think there is no question but that the overlapping of activities and the absence of clear-cut responsibility diminish the effectiveness of the government, the international organizations and the voluntary agencies. The great need is for thoughtful people and interested organizations to concern themselves with the nature and the dimensions of the problems involved and, hopefully, to try to rescue the refugee problem

from the domestic politics involved in changing the McCarran-Walter Act. Both matters are important, but they should be considered separately and realistically.

The refugee problem is a problem for the whole free world, and it is important that we find an international solution. The simple fact is that the United States cannot solve the problem alone, we cannot accept all of the world's refugees here.

I believe that there will have to be an enlargement of the Charter of the ICEM or the office of the United Nations High Commissioner, or some other international agency, that it will have to be more suitably financed and that it will have to face up to the whole problem. We will have to recognize that more is required than resettlement of some of the displaced in Europe and abandonment of the much more tragically displaced in Asia. The programs that are undertaken will have to be as permanent as the problem and will have to include a continuing re-examination of what our long-range, and short-range objectives should be.

I think the religious voluntary agencies have the capacity to be considerably more effective in long-range planning about these problems than they have been. Government programs are usually only half-answers that are inadequately thought out. Many issues are never really faced squarely.

I remember that in the beginning of the evacuation of Hungarian refugees from Austria, I often wondered what we would do if the flight continued until half of Hungary had arrived. And, suppose Poland erupted. Were we going to resettle them all and abandon Eastern Europe to the Communists?

When we were resettling 4,000 Chinese who had fled from the mainland to Hong Kong and Formosa, I could not help but think of the millions for whom practically nothing was being done.

I don't know the answers to these questions—but I do know that we should find the answers, and I do know that merely amending the McCarran-Walter Act isn't it.

We can't sit back and expect Congress to pass a law admitting all the suffering victims every time a volcano erupts on the Azores, or a typhoon sweeps Japan. I do not mean to suggest that we should not liberalize our immigration laws. I do mean that this is not the right way to solve the refugee

problem, and that a refugee crisis will not produce a proper revision of the McCarran-Walter Act.

My plea is that the religious agencies take on the important job of thinking about both problems. I think that if some hard thinking were done it would be possible to produce an immigration proposal that would eliminate most of the nationality discriminations in the McCarran-Walter Act and still retain the kind of over-all and, probably, regional quotas that will be necessary to win the support of Congress. Thinking and planning, and a real effort to stimulate joint action by many governments is certainly necessary before the next refugee crisis is upon us.

Summary

OUR discussion on immigration divided itself into two distinct areas which our group felt must be kept entirely separate: (1) the problem of revision in our basic immigration laws which cover regular annual immigration to the United States; and (2) the problem of special provisions to meet the emergency needs of refugees who need asylum in time of crisis.

Our morning session concentrated on the basic immigration laws. Dr. Amundson traced the history of immigration from the days of unrestricted and even solicited immigration to the United States, through the growth of nativism tendencies with their suspicion of foreigners to the passage of the first quota immigration law in 1921, and its recodification in 1925. The 1952 Immigration and Nationality Act, our prevailing immigration law, continues the quota system with its discriminatory factors based on national and racial origins.

Dr. Mihanovich discussed the social and political implications of our present immigration policies and emphasized that we alienate peoples in other countries by the hostility toward them expressed in our national origins system. "A fair and democratic system of allocating the available visas can do more for our foreign policy than all the billions of dollars spent on foreign aid programs," he said. Dr. Mihanovich emphasized that the critics of present immigration policies do not seek a return to unrestricted immigration, but they do call for a just and equitable distribution of quota numbers.

Monsignor Kelly examined present immigration policies in the

light of moral principles and the traditional rights embodied in the laws of western nations. The Magna Carta, the United States Constitution, and the prevailing legal opinions in western thought all imply that freedom of movement is a fundamental right of man. More recently, our Holy Father, Pope Pius XII, has written extensively on the rights of man to share the goods of this earth, and warned that excessive nationalism cannot justify the denial of human rights.

In summarizing the opinions expressed at the morning session, the following statement is presented:

Aware of Pope Pius XII's frequent reminders that man has a natural right to the fruits of this earth and that nations must honor man's right to move from the country of his birth to another country when this is necessary to provide for himself and his family; and devoted to traditional American principles concerning the value of the individual person; we find that the perpetuation of discriminatory practices in the immigration laws is out of keeping with man's natural rights and offensive to democratic ideals: it is the recommendation of the meeting on immigration that the present immigration laws be revised completely.

* * * * * * * * *

The afternoon's session concerned itself with the problems of the refugee. Mr. O'Neill described the resettlement program in Milwaukee and Monsignor Rilley told of his experiences with the resettlement program in Philadelphia. Both mentioned problems such as refugees who expected too much and were not willing to accept jobs offered to them, or the skepticism of Americans who doubted whether refugees deserved special help. Still, the decision in light of some 10 years' experience with displaced persons, arrivals under the Refugee Relief Act and the more recent Hungarian escapees, was that the refugees had made a good adjustment; the American communities have accepted the new arrivals, and Milwaukee and Philadelphia would be prepared to assist new refugees who might need asylum in the future. Mr. Gerety drew upon his experience in the State Department to emphasize the vital importance of voluntary agencies in resettling refugees. He stated unequivocally that government could not cope with the

problem unless there was continuing cooperation from the voluntary agencies, particularly the religious agencies.

It was the opinion of the meeting on immigration that the refugee problem was a world-wide problem; that the United States was only one of many countries concerned with assisting the refugees, and that a strong international agency with an adequate budget was needed to examine the needs of refugees and decide on the best solutions.—Mrs. Joan Davis, Secretary, NCCC Committee on Immigration; Assistant, Resettlement Division, Catholic Relief Services—NCWC, New York, N. Y., *Recorder.*

THE CONTRIBUTION OF CHILDREN'S INSTITUTIONS IN SERVICE TO THE COMMUNITY

Chairman: Rev. Philip A. Jarmack, *Associate Director, Catholic Charities of Buffalo*

Participants: 1. Walter Suchowiecki, *Director of Casework, Baker Hall, Lackawanna, N. Y.*

INITIALLY I think it would be most helpful to comment briefly on some facts concerning children's institutions in relation to the total field of child welfare.

Prior to the 20's institutional care was practically the only form of care for dependent children. With the advent of the foster care program, improved adoption practices and standards, the development of the Social Security program, and improved social services, the so-called "orphan" and normal dependent child of just a few years back has disappeared from our rolls.

Throughout the nation the effects of this change have produced various results. Many institutions have closed their doors. Others are experiencing dwindling populations and I suspect will continue to do so. In the Buffalo area alone in the past ten years six large institutions have closed, while others are experiencing a drop in population.

Today child care agencies are placing fewer children, but on the other hand, the children who require separation from family life are more difficult. Institutions, as well as foster home programs, are faced with the increasing dilemma of utilizing yesterday's services to meet the needs of youngsters with today's complex problems. Regardless of how you classify these chil-

dren—be it the emotionally disturbed, the so-called delinquent, the child severely abused, neglected or damaged beyond repair from a broken home—you and I are asked to patch, to mend, to redirect these children to meet the ever-increasing challenges of the modern world.

While some institutions have closed their doors, never to reopen them again, others have taken up the challenge to meet the needs of the troubled child who requires specialized care in an institutional setting. By no means am I advocating that all institutions serving dependent and neglected children should either close or make radical changes in program. Each in its own community is best judge as to what services are needed.

With an increasing child population and an increasing number of family breakdowns an increase in the number of facilities needed can be anticipated, not only in institutional settings but likewise in foster home care programs. The children of today cannot be served in the usual foster home because foster parents are unable to meet the needs of these troubled children, also these children are not acceptable to most foster parents.

Our knowledge of child welfare is continually expanding and we in the field of social service have a responsibility not only to the children, but to our communities and supporters to utilize this knowledge to provide the best possible services.

We stress the importance of the demand for specialized services both in institutions and foster home care programs, realizing the frustrations the caseworker is faced with in trying to plan for the seemingly unwanted child—unwanted in many instances because the institutions are not prepared to care for this child.

The New York State Department of Social Welfare has recognized the importance of the need for revision of rules and standards for child care institutions. A state-wide committee composed of institutional board members and directors was organized last year to revise the present rules and standards governing child care institutions. Although the final approval rests with the State Department, this committee provided an excellent opportunity for representatives of child care institutions to contribute suggestions from their actual experience.

In the Diocese of Buffalo, as indicated earlier, out of the six large child care institutions, three have closed their doors permanently, the other three have changed or modified their programs

so as to give specialized care. (One for adolescent girls, one for retarded children, the other a group care facility for teenage boys.)

I would like to tell you how this latter institution took up the challenge to provide a much needed service in our community.

As many social workers are presently experiencing, to secure suitable foster homes or resources for teenagers is very difficult. Many foster parents, though sympathetic toward the child, fear the responsibility of this growing-up stage, more so if the past history of the child is replete with problematic behavior. As a result too many of our boys especially were getting into serious difficulty. Correction schools were often utilized as a last resort and of necessity.

A few of the staff members at the Catholic Charities of Buffalo, with this year's Conference President, Msgr. Wozniak, and Msgr. McPherson, Superintendent of Our Lady of Victory Homes of Charity, jointly embarked upon plans for a service for this particular group. Much credit rests with Msgr. McPherson who willingly accepted the responsibility to undertake this challenge with the zeal and enthusiasm of the founder of Our Lady of Victory Homes of Charity, the late Father Baker.

St. Joseph's Boys Home, serving dependent and neglected boys through the eighth grade, took on the new name of Baker Hall, in honor of the Beloved Founder. Although the building is large, old and from many standpoints replete with limitations, we were convinced that with some remodeling and refurnishing and above all an accepting atmosphere created by the staff, we could overcome obstacles and do a good job.

Baker Hall was initiated for the purpose of serving teenage boys (13-18) who by necessity must be separated from their own homes. The charter was extended to accept delinquent boys. Essentially we are not interested in what the boy did in the past, but how much we can give of ourselves to help him. If the staff is convinced they can help him, and if the boy so desires, he is admitted. Our court commitments of dependent and neglected boys are handled in like manner. The boy must voice his desire to come and remain at Baker Hall; he is not forced to remain.

The activities at Baker Hall are under the supervision of a program director. He works closely with the housemother and counselors in administering a flexible program, based on the group as well as individual needs of the boys. The boys are en-

couraged to share their ideas and desires, not only about the activities but also the rules of the house. We don't plan *for* our boys but *with* them. It is our firm belief that the boys have a right in the making of decisions and can make wise ones with the proper encouragement and guidance.

Boys are encouraged to participate in community activities, recreational and educational, as individuals. They attend various schools in the community. Why isolate our boys from the community if we expect them to be citizens in their respective communities in the very near future?

Casework service is provided for the boys and their families by a trained and experienced casework staff. Every effort is made to utilize related services of medicine, psychology, psychiatry to bring about the total adjustment of the boy whenever indicated.

Presently on the staff at Baker Hall is one housemother, from the Order of St. Joseph. Sister Yvonne has years of institutional experience and she has been with us since the initiation of our program. Barely reaching the five-foot mark, but full of "know how" in handling teenage boys, it is gratifying to see her in action as she works along with the boys, most of whom tower over her.

To complement the work of the housemother, mature male counselors round out the staff. A day at the beach, a picnic, skating parties, a basketball game, a dance, are a few of the many activities in the stay of a boy at Baker Hall. Occasionally school and neighborhood friends are in on the planning for these activities, particularly girl friends when a dance is planned.

An activity which we have had during the past two summers and which has been most successful is trip camping with a group of seven or eight boys in the agency-owned station wagon. Scheduled trips to New England, New York City and State parks have been most successful. Towing a trailer loaded with tents, camping equipment and food, meeting other campers, sightseeing, and above all working together as a team have many gratifying effects. Average cost of the trip ran approximately $100 for a group of eight or nine for one week.

Baker Hall is still an infant with a history of approximately 18 months. To say that there have been no hardships or incidents would not be quite true. Redirecting the established patterns of behavior in a 14- or 15-year-old boy is not an easy task. Failures

we have encountered and will continue to do so. To close the door to a boy we find hard to handle, or who fails to respond to our care, I am certain is painful to many dedicated people in institutional work. I say, dedicated, for I have been at both ends of the line, in the placement agency and presently in the institution itself. Perhaps it takes this kind of living experience to recognize and appreciate the long and unselfish dedication of the good Sisters who have pioneered and continue to labor in the hundreds of institutions in this country.

The initial step in our planning has been completed. We have gained some knowledge and experience with the type of boy who needs our help. We have tested some ideas, abandoned others and are willing to learn new ones. Only the future will tell whether we're successful.

Experience throughout the country has shown that this particular group presents unique problems which the foster home cannot meet. In like manner the large congregate type of institution has definite limitations for the adolescent who does not require a secure and highly protective setting.

It is generally believed that adolescents find it difficult to accept substitute parents or family patterns of dependency, and are better able to accept group living than foster home placement.

Large institutions of necessity require strict discipline and conformity to rules and standards. Many adolescents in this kind of setting are regimented to adherence and come into conflict from their attempts to gain individual desires and needs, particularly their need for independence and preparation for adult living.

As an extension of service for our present facility which is staffed for approximately 26 boys, a group residence or group foster home has been purchased in a residential section of the city. This will accommodate eight boys. By the end of next week, it is our hope to commence to move in some of our boys. Depending on the success of this venture an additional home or homes are in the planning stage. Selection and placement of boys in the group residences would be accomplished after a period of study in the main reception unit which we presently occupy. The staff will have sufficient time to know the boys, and determine their needs and ability to utilize community living as a step toward adulthood. These group residences would give the boy the opportunity to develop in accordance with the needs of a

normal adolescent. Here there should be sufficient room for flexibility in dealing with individual personalities, much more than in a large institutional setting.

Looking ahead to the near future, two cottages accommodating 10 to 12 boys each, are on the drawing board to replace our present facility, which will serve as a reception unit for the more difficult youngsters. With additional experience, knowledge, and continued support the staff at Baker Hall hopes to constantly improve its service so that in the near future the percentage of problem youngsters who cannot be accepted will be at a minimum.

In conclusion may I stress that institutions have a very definite contribution to make to the total field of social service. All of us here today who are close to the work need no convincing. If we can remember that the children we serve are human beings with personalities like our own, with feelings of pain, sorrow, fear and anger, only more so, we in the institutional field will not let them down.

CHILDREN'S INSTITUTIONS IN THE DIOCESE OF ERIE MEET COMMUNITY NEEDS

2. Sister Mary Leo, S.S.J., *Caseworker, Catholic Charities, Erie, Pa.*

THE Diocese of Erie, under the jurisdiction of His Excellency, The Most Reverend John Mark Gannon, includes 13 counties of Northwestern Pennsylvania. Serving the Diocese there are three children's institutions under Catholic auspices, all located in or near Erie, the See City. The institutions are Gannondale, Harborcreek School for Boys, and St. Joseph's Home for Children. Gannondale cares for delinquent and pre-delinquent girls; Harborcreek, for delinquent and pre-delinquent boys; St. Joseph's Home, for dependent and neglected children. All three institutions accept children of all creeds. All three are members of The United Fund of Erie County. All three receive support also from the Diocese of Erie, the families of the children in placement, and the public or private agencies responsible for placement.

Gannondale is a residential school for delinquent and pre-delinquent girls, established in 1935 and operated by the Sisters of Our Lady of Charity of Refuge. About 45 teenage girls live in three cottages, each under its own supervisor. The cottages are

organized to provide a family life as nearly as possible like that of a good home. Each girl helps with the housekeeping, is responsible for her school work, and participates in social, religious, and recreational activities within and outside the cottage. The joys and tensions of these normal activities, experienced and interpreted by the girls with the support and guidance of the cottage mothers, are the basis of the treatment Gannondale provides to disturbed girls who can benefit from it.

Admissions to Gannondale may be made through court commitment, private placement agencies, and/or parents. The institution accepts only girls of normal intelligence without serious physical illness or disability, who have some desire to work through their difficulties.

Harborcreek School for Boys, a congregate type institution established in 1911, cares for 80 delinquent and pre-delinquent boys. A secular priest is superintendent of the institution; he is assisted in the care of the boys by Sisters of St. Joseph. Referrals are made to the Harborcreek School by juvenile courts and by public or private placement agencies. At admission boys must be between the ages of nine and 15 years; they may remain through high school if necessary.

As its name indicates, the institution is organized and operated as a school—a school for boys who for a time need a more highly structured setting than family life can offer. Elementary classes are held on the grounds. High school students attend classes in city schools, and may be permitted to participate in school activities after classes and in the evenings. Supervised crafts and recreation in the institution and unsupervised visits and vacations in the community help train the boys to accept authority on the one hand and to exercise personal responsibility and self-discipline on the other.

St. Joseph's Home for Children is a congregate type institution in which Sisters of St. Joseph care for 250 to 300 dependent and neglected children from infancy through high school age. Admissions are arranged through the Catholic Charities of the Diocese. In spite of caring for such a large number of children, the institution strives to keep its program unregimented and to provide for the needs of the children as individuals. The institution works with the agency toward the return of the children to their homes at the earliest suitable time. For children who cannot

return home, institution and agency together work toward the development of alternative plans which best meet the children's needs.

With this much information as background, let me try to tell you more specifically how these institutions meet the needs of our community.

Community, if you stop to think of it, is a complex term. Besides the institutions, which are themselves in the community, it includes the children who might need placement, the families of those children, other families and children who may never need the most obvious service which the institutions offer, and social workers. All these parts of the community the institutions serve.

It is a fact and not a pessimistic generalization that most of the children who are placed in our institutions come from broken families or from families in which relationships were strained for a fairly long time before placement. Their experience has not only made the children unhappy, it has caused them to lose confidence in themselves and others. Some of them express their unhappiness in aggressive behavior, such as stealing, fighting, running away, or, more indirectly, bedwetting. Others betray their feeling less by their behavior than by their attitudes. They may be moody, unaffectionate, unappreciative, quietly stubborn in pursuing their own interests. Feeling that they have failed in their families, or that their families have failed them, they are often unable to move successfully into another family until they have recovered a little from the pain of failure. In many situations of this kind we turn to our institutions.

Institutions can help many of these disturbed children by offering them the security of a routine schedule, the acceptance and control of a kind but firm groupmother, and the support of a peer group to share responsibility, achievement, sorrow, and joy. I do not mean that they suddenly become angels after placement in the institutions, but that they act upset only periodically instead of perpetually! The children themselves can sometimes tell us what placement means to them. A teenage girl, who has settled at St. Joseph's Home after experience in many foster homes and periods in the care of an alcoholic father, has exclaimed to me several times, "It's so peaceful here!" She is far from completely satisfied, but her basic feeling in the Home is one of security.

Another youngster, getting adjusted at Gannondale after a tempestuous year of angry resistance to authority in her family, told me with relief, "I don't feel so mean all the time now." The parents of the children, too, who have tried to work out some peace plan with them at home, often feel guilty when placement becomes necessary, but are at the same time glad that their children are safe for a while.

Institutional care is valuable in part for those qualities which make it different from life in the family and the community. Yet institutions must also be responsible for helping their children maintain and strengthen their ties in the community.

Most of the children in the three institutions go out to school and are permitted to participate in extra-curricular activities. Teachers and groupmothers have worked together over the years, even through difficulties, toward deeper understanding of the children's problems and needs. A definitely positive feeling has been built up between the schools and the institutions. This is one situation in which the children come to realize they are accepted outside the institution as well as within its walls.

The children also benefit from the contributions of volunteers who sometimes direct or share special activities within the institution and provide useful experiences for the children in the community. Visiting and vacations are other activities used by the institutions in varying ways, but with the common end of working toward the children's rounded development.

All I have said so far points up the fact that the primary service of institutions to our community is their care of children in placement. They thus perform a valuable work for the future as well as for the present, in guiding many of these youngsters to good citizenship in a happy adult life.

Summary

IT was a basic conclusion of the group that the types of children in institutions have changed, requiring a change in the kinds of services to be rendered by institutions.

Institutions are being asked to provide, and are providing services for the following types of children:

1. Children whose parents specifically request placement in institutions.
2. Children of large families, to keep the unit together.

3. Children of school age whose parents cannot at the time maintain a home for them.
4. Adolescents who are beginning to become independent of parental ties and respond favorably to group living.
5. Children whose parents cannot accept foster parents.
6. Children who are emotionally unable to relate to and accept substitute parents.
7. Children with severe personality disturbances.
8. Children who need, for a limited time, an institutional setting, pending plans for long-term placement or return to their own homes.
9. Children in need of diagnostic observation and study, accompanied by consistent and coordinated treatment.
10. Children who need control and protection which can only be provided in the structured setting of group living.

In the process of change which institutions are undergoing there is indicated a need of additional, and perhaps intensive training of houseparents. Religious communities, just as they train teachers, nurses, and social workers, should train houseparents for their specific work.

Resources for such education were found to be already in use in California, Connecticut, Nebraska, New York, Texas, and Wisconsin, some under the auspices of universities and some provided by executives of child-caring institutions. It was felt that administrative personnel of the institutions should take the initiative in having workshops, seminars, and courses for houseparents included in the curricula of schools of social work.

Religious as the staff of child-caring institutions are aided by the fact that they are banded together through spirituality and through belonging to an Order. Trained Sisters can help each other and help untrained Sisters in their work. Religious can provide permanency of staff, as well as mobility.

Interpretation to the community of changing institutional programs and types of children now being accepted is necessary in order to receive continuing support from the community.

One specific area of program discussed was education. It was recognized that wherever possible every Catholic child in our institutions should receive a Catholic education. Wherever possible it would seem best that they should attend Catholic schools outside the institutions.—Sister Mary Leo, S.S.J. Caseworker, Catholic Charities, Erie, Pa., *Recorder.*

PART III

BUSINESS SESSION

Monday, September 22, 1958

Chairman: Very Rev. Msgr. William L. Wozniak,
Buffalo, N. Y.

President, National Conference of Catholic Charities

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY

Rt. Rev. Msgr. John O'Grady

LAST year the National Conference of Catholic Charities joined with the Charities of many other countries in dramatizing the meaning of the Good Samaritan for the children in our grade schools. As we viewed the drawings of our children in the exhibit "The Good Samaritan as Seen Through Children's Eyes" in the Pavillion of the Holy See at the International Exhibition in Brussels, we began to realize what this might mean in the development of a national brotherhood of charity in our country. From the drawings it was clear that for the most part our school children felt that the work of the Good Samaritan was confined to the priests and Sisters. We discussed this with some of our Catholic educators and found that they were very much interested in developing in the grade school children a broader picture of the Good Samaritan. Working with our educators in dramatizing the lesson of the Good Samaritan in our grade schools will be one of the principal objectives of our Conference during the coming year.

Our high school students too should become involved in works of service, and enthusiasm for this ideal is shared by many of their teachers. They will have ideas of their own in regard to the lesson of the Good Samaritan. We hope to cooperate with our educators during the next year in promotion of Good Samaritan projects in our high schools.

The recent Training Program for Groupmothers sponsored by the Conference of Religious in Cleveland has convinced us that we have made some progress in bringing the lesson of the Good Samaritan to the students in our colleges. We have already

enlisted a number of our colleges in this campaign. Here, also, we have been joining hands with the leaders in Catholic education.

The Aging

The reception accorded our three parish studies of the aging has encouraged us to continue these studies. The results of these studies have recently been summarized in a pamphlet entitled *The Aging of Three Parishes—A Research Program of the National Conference of Catholic Charities.* This pamphlet is available to all our members and also for general circulation.

Our studies of the aging are unique not only in this country but throughout the world. We are not confining ourselves to the dependent aging or to those needing institutional and nursing care. We want to develop a broader picture of the aging, a picture of their resourcefulness, the strengths of their family life, the plans that they have made for themselves, their independence.

Our new study of the aging in St. Rose of Lima parish in Milwaukee will emphasize the family relationships of the aging, also their participation in the activities of the parish and the community.

Community Development

Our contribution to community development is really a practical application of the ideal of personal service. We have long been convinced that the only truly effective method of dealing with community problems is through an organization of all the people, of all the churches, and of all the organizations in the community. In the Lackawanna Citizens' Project, sponsored by the Catholic Charities of Buffalo, N. Y., under the auspices of our Conference, we have a demonstration of community organization involving all the people. It is evident that many of our organizations are now beginning to understand the principles and objectives involved in the Lackawanna project. We can already notice a shift in the programs of our local organizations toward the same objectives involved in Lackawanna. The approach is very simple. Ordinary people now have their own ideas of what they can do in their neighborhoods. They begin with simple things like repairing their homes. They enter into the planning of neighborhoods.

Next February, we shall launch another community self-help program in the Diocese of Helena, in Western Montana.

New Suburbias

In the near future we expect to make a study of relocation of families that have been compelled to move from the downtown area in a certain city, out into the suburbs. We have had some experience in dealing with new suburbias in our Lackawanna project. We have been talking a great deal about the challenge of the many new suburbias but we have not made any studies on which a program can be based. We expect to begin such a study in the immediate future.

Housing

Since 1930 the National Conference of Catholic Charities has been in the heart of all discussions of housing for low-income groups. It is generally recognized that we have made a pioneer contribution in this field. As part of our interest in housing we have been involved in the whole program of urban renewal in the United States. Right now we find ourselves at the parting of the ways. The public housing program has not been working out satisfactorily. It is not meeting the needs of low-income families; it is not meeting the needs of those who have been displaced by the vast programs for renovation of our neighborhoods; it is not meeting the needs of the great number of families displaced by new highways. Within the past six months our Conference has been campaigning for a new approach to public housing. We would like to see public housing made a step toward home ownership. This was done in making land and homes available to young farmers through the Bankhead-Jones Act. The same thing was done for young families settled on the land that was reclaimed from our arid deserts. A new approach to public housing is the only means of providing homes for the hundreds of thousands of families who have been displaced by one or another form of Government action in our cities. It is the only means of rebuilding the downtown areas of our cities for the lower middle-income families.

The International Front

Our active participation in the work of the International Conference of Catholic Charities has brought us into close relationships with the national organizations of Catholic Charities of other countries throughout the world. We are also working in close cooperation with Catholic Relief Services of the National Catholic

Welfare Conference. As a part of our participation in the work of the International Conference of Catholic Charities we enjoy a Consultative Status before the Economic and Social Council and other instrumentalities of the United Nations.

With the International Conference of Catholic Charities, we are engaged in a pilot project of community organization in the new State of Ghana. This is really an essential part of the work of the International Conference of Catholic Charities. It has often been acknowledged that we have made splendid statements on community development. Now we have made a beginning in setting up a practical demonstration of these principles in Ghana. Under the able leadership of the bishops and missionaries there we have organized a number of projects in various dioceses. We have also, in cooperation with the Department of Community Development and Mass Education of Ghana, set up a training program in community development for missionaries from other countries. It is our hope that the experience developed in Ghana can be of value to missionaries in other African countries.

Work With Religious Communities

What the Conference has done for the social development of our religious communities in the past 12 years is one of the most significant chapters in its history. We have helped the Sisterhoods in the development of a new literature on institutional care of children and other aspects of child welfare. We have made a beginning in helping the Religious develop a literature on institutional and nursing home care of the aging.

Training Programs

The Conference has not overlooked the great importance of training programs for the personnel of Catholic agencies; also the importance of helping in the development of trained personnel for our governmental agencies. We have two committees at work on this matter at the present time, one a Committee of the Conference, the other one representing the Directors of Catholic Charities. These committees are endeavoring to discover the personnel needs of Catholic agencies. They are working closely with Catholic schools of social service and with our agencies in interpreting professional social service. The new apostolate that we are endeavoring to develop in our Catholic high schools and col-

leges should be most helpful in stimulating recruits for service in our agencies, and likewise in governmental agencies.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON RESOLUTIONS

Mr. Thomas J. O'Donnell, Chairman of the Committee on Resolutions, read the following report:

WE, the delegates to the Forty-fourth National Conference of Catholic Charities, meeting in Columbus, Ohio, under the sponsorship and patronage of His Excellency, The Most Reverend Clarence G. Issenmann, S.T.D., Bishop of Columbus, express our gratitude and appreciation through the following resolutions:

To His Holiness Pope Pius XII for His paternal interest and constant example of Christian love as expressed in His Apostolic Blessing sent to the Conference and its members;

To His Excellency, The Most Reverend Clarence G. Issenmann, S.T.D., Bishop of Columbus, host to the Conference, for his generous hospitality and for his gracious participation in our assemblies;

To His Excellency, The Most Reverend Christopher J. Weldon, D.D., Bishop of Springfield, Massachusetts, for his eloquent sermon at the Solemn Pontifical Mass, delivered on the happy occasion of the twenty-ninth anniversary of his ordination;

To His Excellency, The Most Reverend William A. Scully, D.D., Bishop of Albany and Episcopal Adviser to the National Conference of Catholic Charities, for the wise counsel he has made available to our Conference leaders;

To His Excellency, The Most Reverend Patrick A. O'Boyle, D.D., Archbishop of Washington, and to His Excellency, The Most Reverend Edward G. Hettinger, D.D., Auxiliary Bishop of Columbus, for the interest shown and the inspiration provided by their presence at this Conference;

To Very Reverend Monsignor William L. Wozniak, President of the National Conference of Catholic Charities, for his forward looking and vigorous leadership in the affairs of the Conference;

To Very Reverend Monsignor William E. Kappes and Very Reverend Monsignor Lawrence J. Corcoran, Executive Secretaries of the Columbus Committee, and to the members of the Columbus Convention Committee for their gracious hospitality and solicitous anticipation of the needs of the delegates;

To Very Reverend Monsignor Raymond J. Gallagher, Chairman of the Program Committee, and his associates on the Committee, for a well conceived program adapted to promote Christian personal service through new ideas and professional techniques blended with the traditional spirit of Christian charity;

To all those who have participated in the program, sharing with us their competence and charity;

To George E. Heneghan, K.S.G., President of the Superior Council, Society of St. Vincent de Paul, for his eloquent message to the total Conference membership, and to Francis B. Delahanty, Secretary of the Superior Council, who so ably presented Mr. Heneghan's sentiments in the absence of the President of the Superior Council;

To the officers and members of the Conference of Religious, who through the years have devoted their efforts to the attainment of skills and techniques to better develop the works of charity sponsored by the Sisters;

To the officials of the city of Columbus and the State of Ohio, the Convention Bureau, the Deshler Hilton Hotel, the members of the press, television, and radio, who have helped make our visit here so fruitful and enjoyable;

To our loyal and faithful staff of the National Conference of Catholic Charities whose devotion and skill make possible the success enjoyed by our group. To Monsignor John O'Grady, Beatrice Faivre, Jane Gallagher and Margaret Coffman, we acknowledge our particular indebtedness.

In closing, we extend our most sincere felicitations on his Silver Episcopal Jubilee to His Excellency, The Most Reverend C. Hubert LeBlond, acknowledging his contribution to the advance of Christian charity in the United States and pledging continued prayers for his health.

We ask for your approval of these resolutions as well as for our action in joining with the Society of St. Vincent de Paul in telegramming our felicitations to Bishop LeBlond.

Respectfully submitted,

THOMAS J. O'DONNELL, *Chairman*
St. Louis, Mo.

Sister Marian Cecilia, S.C.,
Nanuet, N.Y.

Very Rev. Msgr. Lawrence J. Corcoran,
Columbus, Ohio

James J. Impastato, K.S.G.,
New Orleans, La.

Mrs. Helen F. Lauer,
Fort Wayne, Ind.

The report of the Committee on Resolutions was unanimously adopted as read.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON TIME AND PLACE

RT. REV. MSGR. GEORGE H. GUILFOYLE, Chairman of the Committee on Time and Place, extended the invitation of His Eminence Francis Cardinal Spellman, Archbishop of New York, to the National Conference of Catholic Charities to hold its Golden Jubilee Meeting in New York City in September 1960. The invitation was unanimously accepted with an expression of appreciation to Cardinal Spellman.

Members of the Committee on Time and Place were: Rt. Rev. Msgr. George H. Guilfoyle, New York, N. Y., *Chairman*; Anne M. Faletto, Kansas City, Mo.; Rt. Rev. Msgr. D. B. Harrington, Helena, Mont.; George E. Heneghan, K.S.G., St. Louis, Mo.; Sister M. Naomi, I.H.M., Scranton, Pa.

FINANCIAL REPORT

STATEMENT OF CASH RECEIPTS AND DISBURSEMENTS

For the period January 1, 1958 to August 31, 1958, Inclusive

Receipts		
Memberships	$28,322.15	
Agency Contributions	30,897.69	
Conference Registration Fees	948.00	
Workshop Fees	1,620.00	
Sale of Publications	848.73	
Miscellaneous Receipts and Contributions	1,400.00	
Total Receipts		$64,036.57
Disbursements		
Salaries	$21,249.95	
Retirement Expense and Benefits	1,253.82	
Books and Subscriptions	398.82	
Conference Expense	1,181.20	
Contributions and Memberships	6,085.00	
Mimeographing	4,653.36	
Office Equipment and Supplies	2,267.73	
Printing	6,812.50	
Rebate	2,023.00	
Postage	1,892.07	
Rent	2,800.00	
Telephone and Telegraph	1,268.82	
Travel	7,891.37	
Total Disbursements		$59,777.64
Excess of Receipts over Disbursements		4,258.93
Add: Balance Capital Account January 1, 1958		35,374.86
BALANCE—CAPITAL ACCOUNT, AUGUST 31, 1958		$39,633.79

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON NOMINATIONS

NEW OFFICERS FOR 1959

THE following names were placed in nomination by Monsignor Szabo, Chairman of the Committee on Nominations:

President

VERY REV. MSGR. WILLIAM L. WOZNIAK, BUFFALO, N.Y.*

First Vice President

VERY REV. MSGR. WILLIAM E. KAPPES, COLUMBUS, OHIO

Vice Presidents

ALFRED W. ECKS, MILWAUKEE, WIS.
FRANCES M. MAHER, KANE, PA.*
JOHN E. MORRIS, K.M., OAKLAND, CALIF.
SISTER VICTORIA FRANCIS, O.P., MARYKNOLL, N.Y.*

Secretary

RT. REV. MSGR. JOHN O'GRADY, WASHINGTON, D.C.*

Treasurer

HARRY J. KIRK, K.S.G., WASHINGTON, D.C.*

New Members of the Board of Directors
(Each to serve for three years)

RT. REV. MSGR. GEORGE H. GUILFOYLE, New York, N.Y.
GEORGE E. HENEGHAN, K.S.G., St. Louis, Mo.*
REV. J. EMMETT MCDONALD, Brooklyn, N.Y.
RT. REV. MSGR. JAMES M. POWERS, Erie, Pa.*
REV. JOSEPH P. SPRINGOB, Milwaukee, Wis.

Respectfully submitted,

VERY REV. MSGR. JULIUS J. SZABO, Lackawanna, N.Y.
Chairman
SISTER M. ANSELM, C.S.M., Boston, Mass.
REV. CHARLES R. HACKEL, Oakland, Calif.
MARY M. HYNES, Youngstown, Ohio
VINCENT M. HEFFERNAN, Cleveland, Ohio
RUTH MICHAEL, Dubuque, Iowa

The report of the Committee on Nominations was unanimously approved as read.

---

* Renominated

NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF CATHOLIC CHARITIES

OFFICERS—1958

Honorary President

Most Rev. William A. Scully, D.D., Albany, N. Y.

President

Very Rev. Msgr. William L. Wozniak, Buffalo, N. Y.

First Vice President

Very Rev. Msgr. William E. Kappes, Columbus, Ohio

Vice Presidents

James B. Carey, Washington, D. C.
Frances M. Maher, Kane, Pa.
Sister Victoria Francis, Maryknoll, N. Y.
T. Raber Taylor, Denver, Colo.

Secretary

Rt. Rev. Msgr. John O'Grady, Washington, D. C.

Treasurer

Harry J. Kirk, K.S.G., Washington, D. C.

Board of Directors

Terms Expiring 1958

Most Rev. Thomas E. Gill, Seattle, Wash.
Rt. Rev. Msgr. George H. Guilfoyle, New York, N. Y.
George E. Heneghan, K.S.G., St. Louis, Mo.
George W. Montgomery, Jr., Rochester, N. Y.
Rt. Rev. Msgr. James M. Powers, Erie, Pa.

Terms Expiring 1959

Rt. Rev. Msgr. A. J. Kramer, Cincinnati, Ohio
Nancy Tarantino, Muskegon, Mich.
Sister M. Immaculate, S.D.P., San Antonio, Texas
Ralph W. Whelan, New York, N. Y.

Terms Expiring 1960

Rt. Rev. Msgr. Vincent W. Cooke, Chicago, Ill.
Rt. Rev. Msgr. Floyd F. Fischer, Omaha, Nebr.
Rt. Rev. Msgr. D. B. Harrington, Helena, Mont.
Rev. James M. Murray, San Francisco, Calif.
Charles J. Tobin, Jr., Albany, N. Y.

PROGRAM COMMITTEE—1958

Very Rev. Msgr. Raymond J. Gallagher, *Chairman*, Cleveland, Ohio
Sister Jean André, C.S.A., Cleveland, Ohio
Carmen V. Artino, Cleveland, Ohio
Miss Katherine F. Casalena, Brooklyn, N. Y.
Very Rev. Msgr. Lawrence J. Corcoran, Columbus, Ohio
Miss Margaret Driscoll, Winona, Minn.
Nicholas von Hoffman, Chicago, Ill.
Rt. Rev. Msgr. A.A. Isenbart, Oklahoma City, Okla.
Richard M. Kelley, Cleveland, Ohio
Miss Ann Kozlowski, Milwaukee, Wis.
Burl C. Phillips, Ann Arbor, Mich.
Miss Catherine E. Pierce, Buffalo, N. Y.
Miss Irene Weber, Seattle, Wash.
Rev. Joseph L. Wingler, Richmond, Va.

OFFICERS OF THE DIRECTORS OF CATHOLIC CHARITIES—1958

STANDING COMMITTEE

Rt. Rev. Msgr. George H. Guilfoyle, New York, N. Y., *Chairman*
Rt. Rev. Msgr. John O'Grady, Washington, D. C., *Secretary*

Terms Expiring 1958

Very Rev. Msgr. J. Richard Feiten, Winona, Minn.
Rt. Rev. Msgr. August J. Kramer, Cincinnati, Ohio
Very Rev. Msgr. Joseph T. Lahart, Chicago, Ill.
Rev. Wilbur Suedkamp, Detroit, Mich.
Rev. Joseph B. Winter, St. Louis, Mo.
Very Rev. Msgr. William L. Wozniak, Buffalo, N. Y.

Terms Expiring 1959

Rev. Leo J. Coady, Washington, D. C.
Very Rev. Msgr. Lawrence J. Corcoran, Columbus, Ohio
Rt. Rev. Msgr. A. A. Isenbart,Oklahoma City, Okla.
Rev. Anthony F. LoGatto, Brooklyn, N. Y.
Rev. William J. Monahan, Denver, Colo.
Rev. Charles A. Smith, Wichita, Kans.

OFFICERS OF THE CONFERENCE OF RELIGIOUS—1958

STANDING COMMITTEE

Sister Maria Mercedes, School Sisters of Notre Dame, Baltimore, Md., *Chairman*
Sister Ellen Joseph, Sisters of Charity of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, Ohio, *Vice Chairman*
Rt. Rev. Msgr. John O'Grady, Washington, D. C., *Secretary*

Terms Expiring 1958

Sister M. Benitia, Sisters of Notre Dame, Cincinnati, Ohio
Mother Divine Heart, Sisters of Our Lady of the Good Shepherd, Independence, Ohio
Sister M. Gilda, Helpers of the Holy Souls, St. Louis, Mo.
Sister Jane Frances, Daughters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul, Chicago, Ill.
Sister M. Leontia, Sisters of the Third Order of St. Francis, La Crosse, Wis.
Sister Marian Cecilia, Sisters of Charity of Mt. St. Vincent, Nanuet, N. Y.
Sister Mercedes of the Holy Trinity, Missionary Servants of the Most Blessed Trinity, Philadelphia, Pa.
Mother Mary of St. Gabriel, Sisters of Our Lady of Charity of Refuge, Erie, Pa.

Terms Expiring 1959

Sister M. Anselm, Sisters of St. Martha, Boston, Mass.
Sister Barbara, Sisters of Charity of Nazareth, Kentucky, Roanoke, Va.
Sister M. Francois, Sisters of Notre Dame de Namur, Columbus, Ohio
Sister Marianne, Benedictine Sisters of Diocesan Jurisdiction, Duluth, Minn.
Sister Mary Elizabeth, Sisters Adorers of the Most Precious Blood, Alton, Ill.

Sister M. Melathon, Sisters of the Holy Cross, Washington, D. C.
Sister M. Naomi, Sisters Servants of the Immaculate Heart of Mary, Scranton, Pa.
Sister M. Victoria, Sisters of the Sorrowful Mother, Winona, Minn.

COLUMBUS COMMITTEE

Host
The Most Rev. Clarence G. Issenmann, S.T.D.

Honorary Chairman
The Most Rev. Edward G. Hettinger, D.D.

General Chairman
William L. Schmidt

Vice Chairmen
Lawrence T. Murnane — Hugh Graves

Executive Secretaries
Very Rev. Msgr. William E. Kappes
Very Rev. Msgr. Lawrence J. Corcoran

Convention Committee
Very Rev. Msgr. Bennett C. Applegate

Rt. Rev. Msgr. James J. Carroll
Very Rev. Msgr. James W. Kulp
Rev. Hugh Murphy
Sister Francois, S.N.D.
Mrs. W. G. Beriswill
Mrs. Harold Breen
T. J. Frericks
Mrs. A. J. Glockner
Lawrence Hoffman
Mrs. Leo Jennings
Miss Helen McDaniel
Arthur Miller
Mrs. Thomas Murnane
T. R. Phillips
Edward Smith
Albert Vellani
Victor Warken
Rev. George Fulcher
Rev. Robert Schmidt
Sister M. Gregory, O.P.
William Bond
James Charles
Nicholas Gallagher
Mrs. T. J. Hinterschied
Mrs. J. R. Holden
Joseph Lang
John Meyer
Harry Mohr
Michael Shevlin
Mrs. Glenn Sheridan
Cornelius Tracy
Mrs. Frank Vogel
Mrs. Carl Williams
Miss Mary L. Zuber

INDEX

A

Abrams, Commissioner Charles. America and the Problems of Intolerance, 45-50.
Aged, increase in number of, 82; interest of Vincentians in, 17.
Aging, contribution of National Conference toward care of, 13; studies of, 130.
Ahearn, Rev. John. Summary on Confidentiality, 63-64.
AFL-CIO, opposition to immigration policy, 93.
APA (American Protective Association), 92.
Amundson, Robert H. American Immigration Policy in Perspective, 90-100.
Apostolate of service in high schools and colleges, 132.
Asia, barriers against immigration from, 99. *See also* Chinese Exclusion Act.

B

Baker, Dudley L. Competence in Charity, 38-44.
Baker Hall, Buffalo Diocese, 121.
Bigotry. *See* Intolerance.
Blind, interest of Vincentians in, 17.
Bodoyere, de la (quote), 8.
Boy Scout movement, program for refugees, 106.
Branch offices, of Catholic Charities, in suburbs, 76.
Brussels World Fair, Vatican City Exhibit, 18, 129.
Buell, Bradley, study of relief in St. Paul, 81.

C

Cana and pre-Cana Conferences, place of social workers in, 67-68. *See* also Family Life.
Carpenter, Dan, N. Y., 32.
Catholic Action, in strengthening the family, 55-56.
Catholic Relief Services—NCWC, 131. *See also* War Relief Services—NCWC.
Catholic Youth Organization, program for refugees, 106.
Celler Bill, on immigration policy, 96.
Child welfare, place of the Church in, 12; League of America, Journal of (quote), 58; services, focus on family in, 53-55.
Children's Institutions, The Contribution of, in Service to Community, 119-124; in the Diocese of Erie, Meet Community Needs, 124-128.
Chinese Exclusion Act, 92, 95.
Church World Service, 104.
Churches, effect of minorities and growth of suburbs on, 48, 49, 79.
Civil Rights, President Truman's Report on, 46.
Columbus, Committee, 140; A Welcome to (Issenmann), 19-20.
Committees, on Resolutions, 133-134; on Time and Place, 135.
Community, Chests and Councils of America, Conference of, St. Louis, 1954, 79; development, interest of National Conference in, 13, 130, 132.
Competence in Charity (Baker), 38-44.
Confraternity of Christian Doctrine, 67.
Confidentiality—A Keystone in Catholic Social Service (Unterkoefler, 57-63.
Contract Labor Law, 92.
Council-General of Society of St. Vincent de Paul, President of (quote), 17.
Councils of Social Agencies, role of, in local programs, 24.

D

Delinquent and pre-delinquent youth, interest of St. Vincent de Paul Society in, 16.
Discrimination in housing, 36-37.
Displaced Persons, Act, 95, 97; Program, 108.
District services, in suburbia, 83.
Disturbed children, institutional care for, 124-127.
Douglas, Mr. Justice (quote), 6-7.
Doyle, Rev. Charles Hugo. *Sins of Parents* (quote), 65-66.

E

England, anti-Negro violence in, 45; public responsibility for needy in, 51.
Erie, Diocese of, Children's Institutions in, Meet Community Needs, 124-128.
Escapee Program, U. S. 98. *See also* Refugee.
Evaluation, an, and Rededication (Heneghan), 14-19.

F

Families, service to—the Function of Voluntary Agencies, 51-57.
Family-centered, Casework, emphasis on, 12, 51-57; programs in welfare field, 21-23.
Family Life, Bureau, NCWC, 67; Education — A Responsibility of Catholic Charities Agencies, 65-72.
Family Service Organization of America, study made by, 66.
Fees, for services, 89.
Fenstemacher, Joseph W. Family Life Education, 65-68.
Financial, problems, distinterest in, 80; Report, 136.
Flemming, Hon. Arthur S. Some Needs in America Social Welfare, 20-25.
Folsom, Hon. Marion B. (quote), 23.
Freedom Fighters, 102, 103, 108.
Fund-raising, for voluntary social services, 85. *See also* Community Chests *and* United Funds.

G

Gannon, Most Rev. John Mark, 124.
Gannondale, 124-125.
Gentlemen's Agreement, 93.
Gerety, Pierce J. The Refugee and U. S. Legislation, 113-117.
Geriatrics, development of, 12, 82.
Germantown Settlement, Philadelphia, 32.
Ghana, community development in, 132.
Good Samaritan, the lesson of, as shown in art, 129.
Groupmothers, training program for, 129; work of, 126, 127.
Guilfoyle, Msgr. George H. The Essential Integration: The Challenge Facing Social Welfare, 2-9.

H

Hall, Prof. Jerome (quote) 6.
Harborcreek School for Boys, Erie, 124, 125.
Hay Market Affair, 91.
Heneghan, George E. An Evaluation and Rededication, 14-19.
Houseparents, training for, 128.
Housing, lack of, for minorities, 47; Open Committee on, Palo Alto, Calif., 37; public, a new approach to, 131.
Hudson Guild, New York, study of housing, 32.
Humanism, Christian, in social services, 5, 7, 9.
Hungarian Refugee Program, 97, 101-108, 112, 113, 116.
HYIAS, 104.

I

Immigration Policy, in Perspective, American (Amundson), 90-100; problems of, 47.
Intake policy, based on services to family, 53.
Integration, The Essential: The Challenge Facing Social Welfare (Guilfoyle), 2-9; in housing, 36-37.
Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration, 98, 116.
International Conference of Catholic Charities, 131, 132.
International Rescue Committee, 107.
Intolerance, Problems of (Abrams), 45-50.
Issenmann, Most Rev. Clarence G., Welcome to Columbus, 19-20.
Ives-Javits Bill, 96.

J

Jewish Theological Seminary, statement of, 25.
Juvenile, authorities, cooperation of St. Vincent de Paul Society with, 16; delinquency, in housing projects, 31.

K

Kaye, Anthony K. Service to Families—The Function of Voluntary Agencies, 51-57.
Kelly, Dick, Cleveland (quote), 67.
Kennedy Amendment, to Immigration Act, 96, 98.
Know Nothing Party, 91.
KKK, 93.

L

Lackawanna Citizens' Project, 130.
Lavanburg Foundation, 32.
Lay Apostolate, Second World Congress of, 38-39.
Layman's role in Church activities, expanding, 13.
Leadership, need of dynamic, 7-8.
Lehman Bill, 96.
Levittown, problems of, 31.
Literacy Bill, 92, 93.
Lyons, Jack, Summary on Family Life Education Program, 72.

Mc

McCarran-Walter Act, 91-95-99, 115-117.
McDaniel, Helen. Suburbia—Whither Catholic Charities, 72-78, 88-89.
McPherson, Msgr., Buffalo Diocese, 121.

M

Martindale, William G. Family Life Education, 68-71.
Mass, Opening, 1.
Mayer, Albert. Meeting the Challenge of an Exploding Urban Civilization, 26-37.
Milwaukee, Particular Council, Society of St. Vincent de Paul, interest in residence requirements, 15-16; experience with refugees, 109-113.
Minorities, problems of the new, 47.
Molly Maguires, 91.
Morton Neighborhood, Philadelphia, 32.

N

National Origins Law, 91-97.
National Social Welfare Assembly, Inc., study of Confidentiality, 58-59.
Native American Party, 91.
Nativism, 91-92, 93.
Naturalization Act, 92.
Neighborhood Councils, development of, 12.
Neighborly service, 14, 18, 41.
New York City Planning Commission, study of housing, 33.

O

Objectives, Our Past, Present and Future (Wozniak), 10-14.
Officers, 1958, 138; 1959, 137.
O'Grady, Msgr. John, 41 (quote), 62-63; Report of the Secretary, 129-132.
O'Neill, Charles A. The Refugee and U. S. Legislation, 109-113.
OUAM (Order of United American Mechanics), 91-92.
Oriental countries, immigration quotas liberalized, 96. *See also* Chinese Exclusion Act.
Outpost, or district services in suburbia, 83.
Ozanam, Frederic (quote), 15, accomplishments of, 18; as example of neighborly service, 41; Schools of Charity, 18, 40.

P

Palestine Refugees, U. N. Relief and Works Agency for, 115.
Palo Alto (Calif.) Area Committee for Open Housing, 37.
Parent-child relationships, principles of, 70-71. *See also* Family Life Education.
Pericles (quote), 88.
Personal service, need of, 6;130. *See also* Neighborly service.
Particular Council, Society of St. Vincent de Paul, Milwaukee, interest in residence requirements, 15-16; experience with refugees, 109-113.
Philadelphia, experience with refugees, 100-108; work of St. Vincent de Paul Society with youth, 16.
Planning and Coordination by Councils of Social Agencies, 24; in urban redevelopment, 28-37.
Pope, John XXIII (quote), 10; Leo XIII (quote), 50; Pius X (quote), 19; Pius XII (quote), 4, 9, 38, 44 (quote), 52, 118.
Pound, Roscoe, 6.
Presidential Address (Wozniak), 10-14.
Public, assistance, improvement in program, 21-25; housing, problems of, 31; opinion, development of, 25.

Q

Quota Law, 1921, 91. *See also* Immigration *and* Refugee.

R

Racism, 91, 92.
Ravitz, Mel, Detroit, 32.
Ready, Bishop, 20.
Record-keeping, simplifying, 77.
Redevelopment, urban, problems of, 26-37.
Refugee, The, and U. S. Legislation, 100-119; Relief Act, 95, 97.
Rehabilitation, of housing, 32; vocational, 21.
Religion, place of, in caring for children, 12; in social casework, 43.
Religious, organization in social welfare field, 24; Conference of, 132.
Research, need of, 23, 63, 85-86.

Resolutions, Report of Committee on, 133-134.
Rilley, Very Rev. Msgr. Thomas J. The Refugee and U. S. Legislation, 100-109.
Ryan, Msgr. John A. (quote), 87.

S

St. Joseph's Home, Erie Diocese, 124-125.
St. Paul, study of relief in, 21.
St. Thomas Aquinas (quote), 62.
San Francisco, Society of St. Vincent de Paul, Ozanam School of Charity, 40.
School, agency relationship, 82; social worker in suburbia, 76.
Schools, of Charity, Ozanam, 18, 40; of Social Service, Catholic, role of, 132.
Scott, Roger. Summary on Service to Families, 56-57.
Secrecy. *See* Confidentiality.
Secularism, results of, 3.
Segregation, in housing, 35-36.
Self-help, projects, 41. *See also* Community development.
Sister Mary Leo, S.S.J., Children's Institutions in the Diocese of Erie Meet Community Needs, 124-128.
Sisters of Our Lady of Charity of Refuge, 124.
Slums, a symptom of deterioration, 27; minorities in, 47.
Smith, Ralph Henry. Suburbia, problems of, 78-88.
Social Security, Act, Amendments to, 23, 24; program, effect on children's institutions, 119.
Social Service Exchange, participation of agencies in, 64.
Society of St. Vincent Paul, anniversary of, 14-19; experience with refugees in Milwaukee, 109-113; Schools of Charity, Ozanam, 18, 40.
Specialization, tendency toward, 52.
Specialized services, demand for, 120.
Standards for child-care institutions, 120.
Studies, of aging, 130; of public housing, 31.
Study, of Confidentiality, 58-59; of relief in St. Paul, 81; of Scope and Methods of Family Service Agency, 66.
Suckowiecki, Walter. Contribution of Children's Institutions in Service to the Community, 119-123.
Supervision, evaluation of, 75, 77.
Suburbia—Whither Catholic Charities (McDaniel), 72-89.
Suburbs, problems of, 27-37, 47, 48, 131.
Suhard, Cardinal (quote), 4.

T

Teen-age boys, a new service for, Buffalo Diocese, 119-124.
Time and Place, Committee on, 135.
Traffic, as a problem of urban civilization, 27, 28.
Training, of groupmothers, 129; of houseparents, 128; of agency staff, 13; of volunteers, 39-41; workers for governmental and private agencies, 132; lack of students in social work, 23; Ozanam Schools of Charity, 18, 40.
Truman Commission (Perlman) on immigration policy revision, 96.

U

United Funds and Councils, 80.
United Nations, participation in, affairs, 45-46, 132; High Commissioner for Refugees, 98, 99, 115, 116.
United States Escapee Program, 98.
Unterkoefler, Rev. Ernest L., Confidentiality — A Keystone in Catholic Social Service, 57-64.
Urban, Civilization, Meeting the Challenge of an Exploding (Mayer), 26-37; renewal, interest of National Conference in, 131.

V

Vatican City Exhibit, Brussels World Fair, 18, 129.
Vincentians, and resettlement of refugees, 109-113. *See also* Society of St. Vincent de Paul.
Vocational rehabilitation program, training under, 21.
Voluntary Agencies, The Function of, in Service to Families, 51-57.
Volunteers, competence of, 39; greater responsibility for, 13.

W

War Relief Services—NCWC, 103-105, 107, 112. *See also* Catholic Relief Services—NCWC.

Weingarten, Victor (quote), 58.

White House Conference on Children and Youth, 1960, 12.

Wilson, President, veto of literacy bill, 93.

Wisconsin legislature, residence requirements, established by, 16.

Wozniak, Very Rev. Msgr. William L. Presidential Address, 10-14.

Wycislo, Very Rev. Msgr. A. J., 121.

Y

Youth, special social service problems of, 82; interest of St. Vincent de Paul Society in delinquent and pre-delinquent, 16; Catholic, Organization program for refugees, 106. *See also* Teen-age.

DATE DUE

GAYLORD PRINTED IN U.S.A.

GTU Library
2400 Ridge Road
Berkeley, CA 94709
For renewals call (510) 649-2500

All items are subject to recall.